DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 388 HE 013 904

AUTHOR Berdahl, Robert, Ed.; And Others
TITLE Statewide Coordination and Governance of Postsecondary Education: Quality, Costs and Accountability: The Major Issues of the '80s.
INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. Inservice Education Program.; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
REPORT NO IEP-912; ISBN-0-932676-05-7
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 51p.; Proceedings of a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education (Wayzata, MN, December 1977). Prepared in part by the Spring Hill Center, Wayzata, MN.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; Budgeting; College Planning; Educational Assessment; *Educational Quality; Educational Trends; *Governance; *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Program Evaluation; Resource Allocation; State Boards of Education; State Government; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Seminars for State Leaders Postsec Ed (ECS SHEEO)

ABSTRACT

A 1978 conference report on major issues of the 1980s in statewide coordination and governance in postsecondary education is presented as part of an inservice education program. The introduction to the report contains the conference summary by Jerome M. Pollack. The keynote address by Richard Millard is presented in three separate sections, organized under the conference sessions' headings: Where Have We Been?, What Are the New Conditions? and What Do We Do in the Future? Other papers are as follows: "College: The Center of the Universe," by G. Theodore Mitau; "Economic Realities," by Carol Van Alstyne; "Accountability," by Robert Berdahl; "Legislative Role," by H. A. Goltz; "Collective Bargaining," by James Rosser; "Program Evaluation," by Thurston E. Manning; and "Some Highlights from Recent Studies on Statewide Coordination and Governance," by Janet R. Clarke. Excerpts from discussions are also included. Among the specific topics addressed are the following: the growth of coordinating boards, the planning, program review or approval, and budget development functions of coordinating boards, trends in postsecondary education, including declining college enrollments and the search for new student clienteles, fiscal problems, accountability concerns, issues pertaining to private, proprietary, and vocational institutions; collective bargaining; the impact of federal legislation and regulations; and changing legislative and executive expectations: attempts to redefine equality of access in narrow economic terms, using a concept of net price; tuition tax credits; and program evaluation to insure quality. (SW)

ED202388

Statewide Coordination and Governance of Postsecondary Education

Quality, Costs and Accountability: The Major Issues of the '80s

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ECS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

LB1013 .904

Spring Hill Center
Wayzata, Minnesota

This report is published by Spring Hill center in cooperation with the Education Commission of the States. The conference was made possible by program grants to Spring Hill Center. Publication does not imply approval by Spring Hill Center or the Education Commission of the States of the views expressed during the conference and included in this report.

Editors: Robert Berdahl, State University of New York; Martha Levin, Education Commission of the States; John Ziegenhagen, Spring Hill Center

Designer: John Ziegenhagen

International Standard Book Number 0-932676-05-7

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 78-65390

Spring Hill Center, Box 288, Wayzata, Minnesota 55391

© 1978 by Spring Hill Center. All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Foreword

Spring Hill Center was the site of a national invitational conference on "Statewide Coordination and Governance of Postsecondary Education — Quality, Costs and Accountability: The Major Issues of the '80s." Some forty-five participants drawn from state legislatures and legislative staffs, statewide boards of higher education, higher education institutions' administrations, foundations, newspapers and national educational organizations gathered December 11-13, 1977 at the conference which was sponsored by Spring Hill Center and the Education Commission of the States.

This report is closely patterned after the format of the conference itself. The keynote address of Richard Millard, director of Higher Education Services of the Education Commission of the States, covered many of the issues discussed in the three subsequent conference sessions: Where Have We Been?, What Are the New Conditions? and What Do We Do in the Future? The verbatim text of Dr. Millard's address is presented in three separate sections, organized under the conference sessions' headings, along with pertinent edited versions of other remarks. The introduction to the report contains the conference summary by Jerome Pollack, president of Fairleigh Dickinson University and member of the New Jersey Board of Higher Education.

The conference discussions fully justified the hopes of the sponsors that there would be a wide-ranging and candid exchange of views. In editing over four hundred pages of transcripts, the editors have tried to strike a balance between leaving in enough of the actual flow of discussion to capture some of the excitement in pursuit of stimulating ideas and removing enough material to tighten coherence.

We wish to extend a special note of thanks to those who were instrumental in the planning of the conference: Clyde R. Ingle, Executive Director, Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board; Richard M. Millard, Director, Higher Education Services, Education Commission of the States; G. Theodore Mitau, Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science and former Chancellor of the Minnesota State University System; and Jerome Pollack, President, Fairleigh Dickinson University and member of the New Jersey State Board of Higher Education.

Spring Hill Center and the Education Commission of the States were pleased to provide this opportunity for those who hold important positions of leadership in the educational community to explore the changing role of educational institutions and to exchange ideas about how those institutions can work together for the mutual benefit of all.

October 1978

Harry P. Day
President
Spring Hill Center

Louis Rabineau
Director
Inservice Education Program
Education Commission of the States

Contents

Introduction
By Jerome M. Pollack 1

Where Have We Been?
Introduction 3
by Richard M. Millard
College: The Center of the Universe 8
by G. Theodore Mitau
Dialogue: Excerpts from the Discussions 11

What Are the New Conditions?
Introduction 14
by Richard M. Millard
Economic Realities 18
by Carol Van Alstyne
Accountability 24
by Robert Berdahl
Legislative Role 27
by H. A. Goltz
Collective Bargaining 28
by James Rosser
Dialogue: Excerpts from the Discussions 29

What Do We Do in the Future?
Introduction 31
by Richard M. Millard
Program Evaluation 33
by Thurston E. Manning
Dialogue: Excerpts from the Discussions 35

Appendix A
Some Highlights from Recent Studies
on Statewide Coordination and Governance 39
by Janet R. Clarke

Appendix B
Conference Participants 44

Introduction

by Jerome M. Pollack

I want to comment briefly about the origins of this conference. Almost a year ago, the president of Spring Hill Center, Harry Day, described to me the Center's programming interests. Because of his longtime concern for higher education, he wanted Spring Hill to be known as a place where people in the field of higher education could meet and discuss a variety of pertinent educational problems. Out of that discussion the impetus for this conference was generated. Soon afterwards, G. Theodore Mitau of the Minnesota State University System and Richard Millard and Louis Rabineau from the Education Commission of the States became involved.

Our feeling was that emerging statewide boards for coordination and/or governance have become the major agency affecting higher education. We also believed that this might be a good time to make some judgments about the role of such boards vis-a-vis the condition of higher education and the problems confronting it. This conference has taken some initial steps to make us cognizant of future needs. Equally important, I hope that we have made some judgments about the past and the present that will permit us to properly address the future.

Several points repeatedly emerged from our sessions. First, in attempting to deal with the future, those of us involved with higher education do not have to be especially concerned with an assessment of what went on prior to the end of World War II. We can begin with the rather amazing post-war revolution which occurred in higher education.

Jerome M. Pollack is President of Fairleigh Dickinson University and a member of the New Jersey State Board of Higher Education.

The critical elements associated with that revolution included both the rapid expansion of higher education, requiring us to deal with very large numbers of people, and the condition that higher education had become a fundamental part of the public consciousness. Following World War II, in a way that had never before been present, higher education became everybody's business. It was the concern of the man on the street, of every parent, of every student or potential student, of all employers and of the legislative and executive branches of the state and federal governments. As a result, higher education has now come of age as a political entity within the political firmament. All conversations during this conference have included this particular notion. We are not isolated: what we do affects other elements in society and, equally important, what other elements in society do affect us.

Second, it has become clear that post-war circumstances, themselves, are now rapidly changing and education is at a point of hesitation. We are on the verge of a new revolution which may, in the long run, change the nature of higher education in this country as effectively and drastically as the period immediately preceeding it. This conference emphasized that the potential changes can be, and are likely to be, profound.

There were several external factors also mentioned during the conference that impinge upon higher education. First, higher education is not its own master; it is not necessarily free to institute desired changes independently from what is happening in society at large. This is true with respect to both federal and state governments. Second, it has become quite clear that the enterprise of higher education never before has been so inten-

sively studied, nor has so much information been available.

This broad spectrum of data, studies and the numbers of people involved creates, in itself, a new condition for higher education which has to be addressed. Clearly, and this was reflected in the discussions, it may be time to re-examine the purpose and function of higher education beyond just dealing with enrollment and numbers. Also, we are at a point where we must recognize that the concept of a common vision regarding higher education may be simply rhetoric.

There are different constituencies who expect different things from higher education. This may always have been the case. For example, parents, and therefore a very large percentage of the voting population, expect one thing from higher education: in its simplest terms it is a place for their children to go to school. That was a driving force in the past. But students expect something else from higher education. As was mentioned at this conference, they expect higher education to be a vehicle that will train them to be productive economically. Students have career aspirations which they expect higher education institutions to help meet.

Employers also expect something of education. I think we sometimes lose sight of the fact that one of the functions of higher education, perhaps right from its beginning, was certification. Employers want some assurance that when they hire someone, he or she has certain kinds of background or training. It should be mentioned, too, that those of us engaged in working as administrators, staff or faculty expect something from institutions of higher education: namely, that we have a place to work. There is tremendous pressure, of which collective bargaining is only one manifestation, for the continuance of job structures and the security associated with it. Government officials also have a different view and different expectations of higher education.

One of the tasks for the future is not only to recognize differences among constituencies, but also to identify the kinds of common goals they might have; and then to develop plans and programs to reinforce the common goals. For example, one critically important function of higher education almost never mentioned – and interestingly enough not mentioned during the course of this conference – is that of keeping very large numbers of people between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four out of the job market. The enormous economic implications of this are illustrated by the G.I. Bill, one of the most important and profound social experiments in which the United States or any other country engaged. A primary reason for the introduction of the education portion of the G.I. Bill was to employ positively large numbers of returning veterans who would otherwise be thrust upon a job market unable to absorb them. There was deep concern about the economy, and the government wanted to avoid a march on Washington similar to that which took place after World War I.

Bringing constituents together by various means may be the single most important responsibility of statewide coordinating or governing agencies. The basic question of the role and function of higher education in society needs to be discussed. If this is not done, the issues raised here may not be properly considered; or they may be addressed in a way which allows them to remain atomistic, which, until now, has characterized the mode of planning. It should be emphasized that the planning function of these boards is their major task; and it will have to be dealt with in a truly holistic fashion. This has never been done well before.

In addressing the planning function, there are two mistakes that those interested in higher education must avoid. First, the description of the system cannot become the prescription for the solution. We must not fall into the trap of allowing what we describe to become a self-fulfilling prophesy about what the future might hold. Second, we must not fail to recognize that the "consumption" of the product is as important as "buying" and "selling" it.

We have available to us means of intervention, and upon this we will have to spend most of our time, attention and intellect. We are dealing with the future of individuals and, in the most important kind of way, with the future of this nation.

Where Have We Been?

Introduction

by Richard M. Millard

Coordinating boards are not a new phenomenon. The first one was established by the first regular session of the New York legislature in 1784 as "the regents of the University of the State of New York" to serve as the trustees or governing board for the reconstituted King's College as Columbia University, but it was also empowered to serve as trustees for "such schools or colleges as might be established in any other part of the state."[1] The law was revised in 1787 giving Columbia its own board of trustees but giving supervisory power to the regents for academies, schools and colleges "to enable them to mold the several institutions into a unity that would serve the best interests of the people of the state as a whole."[2]

Thus the first state educational board in the country was a higher education board—a consolidated governing board for a short period and then for almost two centuries a coordinating board. From the beginning the regents had the explicit responsibility and power to make plans and policies for higher education without regard to distinctions in public and private control. As an historical footnote, the regents did not become responsible for elementary-secondary education until the twentieth century.

Richard M. Millard is Director of Higher Education Services for the Education Commission of the States.

Growth of Coordinating Boards

Before the end of the nineteenth century four states had established consolidated governing boards for their public institutions, and Florida had developed its unique board of education consisting of the governor and his cabinet which still has the responsibility for coordinating all levels of education in the state.

By the end of World War II, seventeen states had established central higher education agencies. The fourteen of these states with consolidated governing boards recognized early, as Robert Berdahl has pointed out,[3] that in periods of expansion the assumption that individual institutional lay boards would protect the public interest is only partially true because of the legitimate ambitions of such boards for their own institutions. Essentially these states decided to control premature expansion and proliferation and financial commitments going beyond the states' resources or needs. The Georgia consolidated governing board established during the Depression (1931) actually eliminated ten institutions.

The real pressures for statewide coordination began in the fifties and accelerated in the sixties and early seventies. Six more coordinating boards, three of which later changed to consolidated governing boards (North Carolina, Wisconsin and Utah), appeared during the fifties. The fifties were also the period of the flowering of voluntary coordinating arrangements.

Such voluntary coordination, however, had two major weaknesses. First, since the success of such arrangements depended entirely on the willingness of the presidents and institutions to cooperate, they tended to be viable only so long as the institutions were not of a competing nature. Second, when voluntary coordination did work, as Lyman Glenny has pointed out,[4] it tended to preserve the status quo and be dominated by the major or largest institutions.

As other institutions grew stronger they tended to challenge the dominant institutions and the need for more formal coordination and regulation became evident. During the sixties and early seventies all of these voluntary structures for statewide coordination disappeared.

It is no accident that the major period of acceleration in the development of state higher education agencies and boards occurred during the most rapid period of expansion of higher education in the history of the country—1960 to 1975. While all types of institutions increased in size, by far the major growth was in public institutions. In 1950 about half the students in the country were in private institutions. Today only 21 percent of the students are in private institutions. Total higher education enrollments in 1960 were about 3.7 million students. In the fall of 1976 enrollments had reached 11.2 million. Total higher education expenditures in 1960 amounted to $5.6 billion. Today they approximate $40 billion. A relatively small segment of higher education in 1960—community and junior colleges—now account for approximately one-third of all students.

The major responsibility for meeting this phenomenal demand has rested with the states. With such major expansion it was not at all surprising that governors and state legislatures created state coordinating and governing boards to deal with the problems of expansion. In fact, in most of the state laws establishing such agencies during this period the stated purpose was "to provide for the orderly growth of public higher education in the state."[5]

Between 1960 and 1975, twenty-four new boards were established. In contrast to pre-1960, most of the boards established since 1960 have been coordinating rather than governing boards. The two exceptions are West Virginia and Maine plus the changes noted in North Carolina, Wisconsin and Utah from coordinating to governing boards. Today, if one includes the two states with executively appointed planning agencies only, all fifty states have some form of state higher or postsecondary board and agency. [The Higher Education Council in Wyoming was abolished by statute on March 3, 1978]. Nineteen of these are consolidated governing boards, eleven of which include all public higher educational institutions and eight of which include only senior public institutions. Twenty-nine are coordinating agencies. Two are executively appointed planning commissions only.

Structures, Functions and Powers

The structures, functions and powers of these boards vary considerably from state to state. In fact there are no two that are exactly alike. They vary in the number of institutions under their purview and their responsibilities in relation to them. Even among governing board states some boards govern most or all public postsecondary institutions and some senior or four-year institutions only. In most governing board states, governance is wholly centralized; however, in two states (North Carolina and Utah) governance is to some extent decentralized through institutional boards of trustees or institutional councils with restricted but delegated powers from the central board.

Coordinating boards vary even more widely than governing boards. They range from states like Oklahoma where the state regents submit a consolidated budget and appropriations are made to the regents who allocate funds among institutions, review and approve all programs and are responsible for planning for all postsecondary education, to states like Wyoming where the Higher Education Council [had] no program review

or budgetary function and [was] primarily a legislatively authorized planning and advisory agency.

Roughly some seventeen states fall into the group that Robert Berdahl would call strong or regulatory coordinating boards in that according to their authorizing legislation they have the power to approve programs and submit consolidated or aggregated budgets to the governor and legislature. In addition, there are two states in which the board approves programs but has no statutory role in the budgeting process and one state with program approval that sets formulas rather than budgets. In two other states the boards submit an aggregated or consolidated budget and review but do not have approval power over programs.

This leaves eight states where the board is technically an advisory board only charged with giving advice both to institutions and state government. But among these eight are three states where in practice the board's advice on programs is tantamount to approval. Just to complicate the picture further, in eight of the states the board or agency responsible for postsecondary education is also responsible for elementary-secondary education and in four of these the same person is the chief state school officer and the state higher education executive officer. In six states the board or its executive officer has cabinet status.

To summarize, in relation to the three major areas in which most boards have some responsibility either prescribed by law or developed by policy—planning, program review or approval and budget development—boards vary from state to state both in the powers they have for carrying out these functions and in the scope of their applicability. In fact, both power and applicability vary in regard to each of the functions in question.

For example, a board may have major responsibilities in the budgetary process, including recommending a consolidated budget, and only advisory responsibilities in program approval. A board, including a governing board, may have statutory responsibility for planning for senior public institutions only, or it may have statutory planning responsibility for the full range of postsecondary education, or, as a third alternative, it may have statutory responsibilities for planning in some areas but as a matter of policy extend its planning functions to other areas.

Finally, a statutorily based board may have executive rather than statutory responsibility for planning in relation to the full range of postsecondary education. In practice a board may be unable to exercise its full statutory responsibility in any one of the three central areas. On the other hand, a board with a relatively restricted statutory base may, through leadership and policy development, extend its influence considerably beyond what is prescribed by law. It must be added that many of the boards have functions in addition to the three major ones that range all the way from administering state student aid programs and various federal programs to chartering and authorizing institutions to operate.

There is another important historical and descriptive fact to keep in mind. To date, no state that has established a coordinating or consolidated governing board has abandoned it for a return to no coordination or voluntary coordination. While coordinating boards have been given up—as in North Carolina, Wisconsin and Utah—they have been replaced by consolidated governing boards. If there is a trend it has been toward increasing the role or power of such boards, including governing boards. Between 1970 and 1975, twenty-three states modified their state higher education agencies and with two possible exceptions the modifications were in the direction of strengthening them. In 1976 alone, seventeen states at least considered modifications primarily in the direction of strengthening board powers and functions.

Today boards across the country are under scrutiny; one might almost say they are in trouble, but the trouble is not that they are too strong but that they are perceived as not having sufficient power to do what legislators and governors expect of them, or if they have the power, they are not perceived as effectively and fully exercising it.

Board Profile Today

So where are we today? We are with fifty different boards across the country—fifty-three to be exact, including the District of Columbia, Puerto

Rico and the Virgin Islands—no two of which are exactly alike. They have been created in individual states to meet indigenous problems, many of which are analogous among groups of states or even across the states but which are not identical. The forms they have taken and the powers they have been given relate to the different histories and the state of higher education and social conditions in these states. This is extraordinarily important to keep in mind for otherwise generalizations come easy and are likely to be either mistaken or seriously misleading.

The fact that forty-eight states have legislatively, and in some cases constitutionally, authorized coordinating or governing boards is rather strong evidence that they were created to meet real needs that were not or could not be met by institutions separately. Perhaps the fundamental need is best expressed in the 1787 New York legislation creating the Board of Regents, i.e., "to enable them to mold the several institutions into a unity that would serve the best interests of the people of the state as a whole."[6]

The fact that other boards did not appear until toward the end of the nineteenth century and the major movement of states to create boards is a phenomenon of the last twenty-five years is an index of the increased importance of higher education as a public policy issue in the light of the number of people concerned and involved. When, as in 1900, only 4 percent of the eighteen- to twenty-four-year-old population was in higher educational institutions, higher education was hardly a matter of major state or federal concern. Beginning with the returning veterans and continuing to today the situation is very different.

Common Concerns

While specific factors that gave rise to such boards and the timing of their formation as well as the form they took varied from state to state, there were some relatively common concerns within the general concern of providing for orderly growth that contributed to their formation and to their functions. Among these were concern *(a)* with the increasing rates of expenditure and a desire to keep these expenditures in perspective and balance, *(b)* with budgetary equity among institutions in the light of their different functions, *(c)* with assuring reasonable diversity among institutions within the system of higher education to meet the variety of state needs, *(d)* to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs not related to demand in the expanding market, and *(e)* with balancing institutional operations with political and social realities as they relate to social and geographical distribution of opportunities.

There was, in addition, in many states a legislative and gubernatorial desire not to have to deal with interinstitutional rivalries directly in executive chambers, in legislative committees and on the legislative floors but to find a means of ameliorating these beforehand. Admittedly, there was and still is more than a little legislative ambivalence on this, particularly in relation to any institutions in a legislator's home district.

In the late sixties and early seventies additional concerns have become progressively prominent, growing first out of student unrest and then out of the changing fiscal situation—recession then depression. These have included concern *(a)* with institutional management and efficiency, *(b)* with far more, and more accurate, information as a basis for decision making, *(c)* with relevance of programs to student needs, *(d)* with accountability for use of public funds, and *(e)* with the relation of postsecondary educational programs to manpower needs and the world of work.

Board Performance

Given the charges and the concerns, how well have statewide coordinating and governing boards performed? Here the answer almost has to be: with varying degrees of success. I have no intention of offering a report card on the state agencies as the Carnegie Council attempted to offer on the states.[7] For me to do so would be highly presumptuous.

State agencies have made mistakes. Some have not involved institutions as fully as might be desired in the planning process. Usually when this has occurred the plan itself has gathered dust on the shelf. Some have found themselves, or let themselves, be caught between legislative and gubernatorial clashes or even in a few cases poli-

tical conflicts within the state in which they could not win.

Some have so identified themselves or been identified with their institutions as to lose credibility with the legislature or the governor. Others have been so identified with their legislature or governor as to lose even minimal institutional confidence and to encourage end runs. Some have not clearly distinguished the role of the board from that of the institutional or segmental governing boards and have moved into areas best left to institutions. Some, as noted, have disappeared and been replaced by stronger agencies.

On the other side of the ledger, and recognizing as is obviously the case that other factors in addition to the existence and activities of statewide agencies contributed to the results, the very fact that states were able to respond to the onslaught of students, suggests that these boards have played a critically important role. As Clark Kerr has pointed out elsewhere,[8] during the period of expansion while not every student necessarily got into the particular institution he or she wanted to, no student was turned away for lack of space.

It should be pointed out that during this period even the so-called "flagship" institutions could not have and had no intention of including all students. If anything, their concerns were with greater selectivity, developing research potential, and becoming "great institutions." This was not only understandable but in the best interests of a diversified system.

Without the statewide concerns with diversification to meet needs—development of community colleges, strengthening the role of teachers' colleges as state colleges or regional universities, creation of specialized institutions, concern with equity—in other words without the balance statewide boards were established to try to facilitiate, the picture might look far more chaotic and public distrust might be considerably greater than is the case today.

One of the lessons that has been rather clearly learned by most states in the process is that "representative" boards tend not to work very effectively. They have some of the same defects that the older voluntary coordinating arrangements did. While boards need as much advice as possible from presidents and institutional representatives, to include such representatives as voting members on boards either tends to logrolling or to inaction on any issue that involves conflict of the vested interests of institutions.

While many of the boards started out with representative members, most states have either eliminated them or made certain that they do not constitute a majority. In only four states today do representative members constitute half or a majority of members.

---

1. Frank Abbott, *Government Policy and Higher Education* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1938), p. 14.
2. Ibid.
3. Robert O. Berdahl, *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971), p. 27.
4. Lyman Glenny, "Politics and Current Problems in Coordinating Higher Education," and John Minter, ed., *Campus and Capital* (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966), p. 38.
5. Ibid.
6. Abbott, op. cit.
7. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *The States and Higher Education: A Proud Past and a Vital Future* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976), chapter 3.
8. Clark Kerr, *The Changing Face of Higher Education* (Southern Regional Education Board, 1973), p. 33.

College: The Center of the Universe

by G. Theodore Mitau

Before World War II, to most of the faculty, students and boards of trustees, their particular college or university campus with its unique and peculiar qualities represented the center of their academic universe. Good presidents were expected to be charismatic leaders and architects of greatness; not infrequently, however, they turned out to be benign dictators. Collegial loyalties were focused on the institution to which alumni returned periodically to regain spiritual strength as well as to compare notes on how life affected former classmates and friends.

Curriculum committees determined programs that were built around a core of concepts of what a liberal arts education ought to be and how it might provide the student with a "kit of conceptual tools" appropriate for successful living. Academic requirements were set high—very high—for most of the selective colleges and universities and program requirements were based on the assumption that the faculty could delineate with confidence and certitude the "universal" academic qualities of an educated man or woman.

For the state teachers colleges, their mission was precise and clear: to be widely accessible and to educate as many teachers as possible. They provided instructional personnel for thousands of school districts throughout the state and nation. Land-grant universities, in many ways this country's most unique contribution to the postsecondary education model, also had their own clearly defined mission. They focused on agricultural research, extension work, professional education in the fields of law, medicine, engineering and all advanced graduate training for the professoriate.

At the smaller liberal arts colleges, faculties treated presidents with deference and respect, as a frown on the poor man's forehead might result in a tenure deferred or professorship denied. At the larger and more prestigious institutions, departmental chairmen had a great deal of power while they or their senior colleagues set academic tone and tenor.

Faculty recruitment occurred at national and professional meetings in an informal and personal mode with success determined by the quality of personal or network contacts. Prestigious institutions determined salary levels, "working conditions" and perquisites of office. Entrepreneurial professors waved telegrams to impress trustees and presidents with their importance and scholarly worth—the more telegrams, the higher the salary, the larger the office, the lighter the teaching load and more "attractive" the secretary. Most of American public opinion respected and trusted its colleges and universities and the values for which they claimed to stand.

G. Theodore Mitau is Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science and former Chancellor of the Minnesota State University System.

Following World War II and well into the fifties, things began to change. Sputnik and Soviet Russia's scientific/technological advances had made their impact on the world. Science faculty walked a little more proudly as science course enrollments climbed and requirements continued to escalate. America had to keep up with Soviet Russia's move into space and our colleges and universities promised to be the indispensable resource in this new race for power and progress. Higher education represented the most widely accepted and efficacious credentializing mechanism for personal upward mobility as well as for national power.

With the G.I. Bill of Rights in place, this country developed one of its most creative and massive strategies to broaden access to higher education for literally millions of our fellow citizens who without such financial assistance would never have dreamed that they might be able to obtain a college education. Mass higher education had become a reality. With the G.I. Bill came good dollars and the veterans were warmly welcomed—they offered good potential and strength of motivation.

Less than half of the students were attending private colleges and even that percentage was declining as enrollment at community colleges, junior colleges and four-year state colleges grew at fantastic rates. Legislatures willingly provided ample funds for the public sector while private corporations and foundations rallied to private postsecondary institutions. In these early post-World War II years, program evaluation and academic audits were unheard of in either public or private collegiate institutions as faculties chose the curriculum within limits set by presidents, boards and the occasional pulling and tugging of strong alumni influences.

In the public sector of higher education, where colleges and universities looked to the capitol for funding, legislative committees found themselves understaffed and lacking analytical capability or "timerity" to take on the sophisticated budgets of state colleges and universities. After all, during these post-war years the overriding thrust was to get students into college, not keep them out. People would talk with their state legislators asking for their influence to help their boys or girls gain college admission. No one pressured legislators to check program quality or review academic budgets. Successful completion of a collegiate education represented the best assurance for upward mobility and personal success. Higher education experienced its "gilded era."

In such a setting, "adult" education and community education represented largely tangential areas of interest to colleges and universities. Academic standards for such extension programs were generally marginal, the faculties were less experienced and the offerings were viewed as rounding out an institution's community service while giving junior professors an opportunity for moonlighting.

The focus of attention was to the undergraduate—the eighteen- to twenty-two-year-olds. Curricular programs were directive and requirements specific (102 follows 101 and 202 follows 201). Before graduating, students approached the registrar's desk, with knees trembling, hoping that all of the necessary requirements were met and that their transcripts proved free from non-transferable or "non-interchangeable" offerings from other institutions since these were rarely accepted and generally devalued.

As enrollments continued to rise and new colleges emerged almost weekly in the sixties, faculty members moved frequently to improve their positions, and anyone who had a bachelor degree or some graduate work seemed safely launched for life on a professorial career. Academic morale was high; the nation's commitment to remake the world through the increased education of its eager men and women seemed unshakable. Professors were the gatekeepers to the new Camelot. Those were the days before performance standards, zero-based budgets, rigid staffing patterns and resource requirements became popular. Only very bad institutions and very bad departments seemed incapable of surviving.

Those were also the days when higher education appeared very little concerned about how many women, blacks or minorities were included in a department's faculty or student body. An institution's or a department's worth was measured in terms of doctorate degrees and of the number of its faculty members who came from Princeton, Harvard, Yale or Berkeley.

Concepts of inter-institutional cooperation or consortial relationships were rarely brought up. While some of the private colleges began to join in the establishment of private college councils, to coordinate their financial drives for corporate and foundation giving, some of the larger universities were beginning to establish branch campuses to respond to the emerging needs for higher education throughout the different regions of the state. Such institutions tended to remain, in most instances, under the direct control of the central campus and administration.

Faculty avoided unions since unions seemed designed to meet the needs of plumbers, blue collar workers and other kinds of people. Many joined the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). That organization's major concern centered on issues of academic freedom and professorial advancement. Faculty members were proud to be academics, a profession onto itself, something of an enclave in the working world. They seemed certain of what the future might bring and confident of the basic curricular configurations that they designed and protected. This, then, was a period when higher education expressed faith in itself, in the centrality of its social position and in the promising future of its institutions.

Dialogue

Excerpts from the Discussions

The Emergence of Statewide Boards

In Shaping Educational Policy, *James Conant described some of the states' conditions that point to the emergence of statewide boards. Legislatures were confronted with a multiplicity of demands for more campuses, money, graduate work and students, which boards and presidents could justify in terms of their own perspective. Issues were complex and controversial. The game of politics was not confined merely to presenting quantitative statistics on the need for new programs or campuses but included things like gifts of seats at the fifty-yard line and reduced rates at university hospitals.*

There began to be a feeling that out of all the conflicting demands for state resources, even though the needs of higher education were greater and more state money was available for it, there might be a more rational way to do it than just letting the loudest or strongest political voice win. In particular there was a feeling that some of the "have-not" institutions might not be getting their proportionate recognition in terms of the distribution of resources.

A pell-mell development occurred in both curricular diversity within an institution and in rapid movement into graduate work on the basis of a whole variety of students, most particularly in the development of the state colleges into multipurpose institutions. There was a diminishing within the states of the power center. All institutions became powerful with respect to their own legislatures and their own districts, resulting in the high development of conflict for resources, mostly by institutions looking or striving to look alike.

The power distribution was not only fragmented among universities and colleges, but there was also reapportionment in state legislatures which spread the power out from the dominant small centers into the suburbs and all over the state. New faces appeared in the legislature which itself began to get more staff and whose receptivity to the old demands began to alter. Legislators began to think that there might be a better way to handle these issues than on an ad hoc political basis.

The influence that the federal government had in the emergence of coordinating agencies within every state in the nation at the time when all this growth was taking place should not be underestimated. Federal legislation concerning the 1963 Educational Facilities Act required every state to incorporate all of the state colleges and universities, private and public, into a methodology for determining priorities within the state. Because of the different data components, it became clear to many legislators that there should at least be a common language, data base and definition.

During the late fifties and early sixties many legislators were becoming disenchanted with the ability of the educational system to respond to new demands and needs. Some states finally mandated that the universities admit two-year community college graduates because legislators grew weary of the efforts of the universities to do anything about trying to reduce the gap between these two systems. Statewide coordination grew in part out

of frustrations on the part of our citizen legislators who could not see an adequate response to new demands.

At that point those in education missed an opportunity by responding to the managerial pressures rather than by making a case for a kind of non-state programmatic view with an institutional and academic understanding, i.e., that there was a difference between the highway department and an academic institution.

The governors' role was being strengthened all over the country. In many states their feeling was that fragmented areas like higher education would have to be reeled in under some kind of supervision and planning by inclusion in the executive office or by placement in a newly created intermediate planning and coordinating agency.

At the same time, program budgeting emerged, which made staffs in the executive and legislative branches think that they had the tools to evaluate higher education and analyze it in terms of cost benefits analysis and program value. So the deference to higher education and the fragmentation that had been there were both yielding to stronger forces from the state capitol.

One thing that kept this growth period within scope was the existence of boards who had at least some responsibility for trying to see that growth took place in a balanced way.

Student Revolt

Even today the academic community may not realize the full impact of the student revolt in the sixties on the question of public and legislative confidence. The credibility gap talked about in the last few years goes back, more than anything else, to this factor.

World War II, and to some extent some of the crises which immediately followed it, brought into question the concept of competence. The person who was a competent person in that war may not have been the credentialed person, for suddenly quality and competencies were discovered in people who did not have a college experience. Great social crises throw into question uncritically accepted standards and practices. The Vietnam War may have exacerbated or accelerated the explosion, but there were other forces at work searching for indices of competence, quality and attainment that were not provided by traditional higher education.

Among the things that happened in the sixties, in addition to Vietnam, was the occurrence for the first time of essentially mass higher education. At the same time, the effectiveness of higher education as a legitimate screening device for upward social and economic mobility was starting to come into question. Institutions had very large numbers of students who were disillusioned as to the effectiveness of higher education either in making them better people or more employable or in producing a better world.

Growth and Replication

When the enrollment explosions occurred, no analysis was available for the fundamental adaptations that may have had to be made. The community college movement quickly exploded in the face of the assumption that the only need was to move a few more chairs into the room, push out the walls, get a few more instructors and continue as in the past.

The key objective was replication: smaller institutions wanted to be medium ones and the medium group wanted to become more powerful. One of the things that statewide boards began to ask was the question of distribution in relation to the educational function. However inadequate at times, at least there was somebody who began to look at the relationship between public concern, legislative intent and institutional structure.

As institutions tried to move their way up the academic prestige ladder, their places were taken at the bottom by new ones that came into the growth market. Insofar as what they tried to copy was some of the quality of the flagship universities, the situation is not to be regretted.

There may be value to what was going on in the so-called glut of graduate work. Because man-

power planning in matching students to jobs is an imperfect science, there was a danger during that period of expansion of overproducing or underproducing appropriate numbers of people for the kind of industry and society of the time. It is better perhaps to err on the side of overproducing than underproducing. Sometimes overqualified people raise the level of performance of jobs that they take as overqualified people.

Presidents and the large institutions knew exactly what they were doing, which relates back to some of the problems that grew out of reinforcing discipline rather than reinforcing institutions. The pressures and the rewards system were geared, in the major institutions, to graduate education. The graduate assistant rate went up more rapidly than the faculty rate, while the part-time faculty was increased to handle the freshman and sophomore courses and extension. This was true not only in the big institutions but also in the intermediate institutions that were aspiring to become graduate institutions. Academic values centered on discipline, graduate education and publication.

In the sixties, growth buried some of the mistakes caused by emerging institutions who offered premature and thus low-quality graduate work. Quality was ultimately achieved, and it was better to have erred on the side of letting in too many entrepreneurs. In the fifties and sixties a great success of the system was the response to the enormous student demand, largely because of a highly decentralized system. Indeed, there were not fifty governing boards but several thousand boards that said how higher education was going to expand. Response had to be made at the individual level and institutions had the freedom to do that.

However, one of the failures of that period was that the response was long-term solutions to a short-term problem, which in many cases was to build new institutions or enlarge existing institutions in permanent patterns. In responding to a twenty-year problem, institutions constructed campuses that would last for a minimum of a hundred years and staffed them with faculty members who had forty years of tenure. They built over-sized libraries which have continuing costs to keep the selection up to date.

If the success of higher education in meeting the demands of growth was due, in part, to a great deal of individualization and flexibility in the system, an opportunity now exists for institutions somehow to profit from having built into the system all kinds of long-term permanent things that will not disappear without enormous difficulty.

What Are The New Conditions?

Introduction

by Richard M. Millard

Today the period of expansion is over. The issues that institutions and state higher education agencies are or will be facing are quite different from those of the third decade of the century; in fact to some extent they are reversed. The critical question becomes whether agencies and boards established to deal with problems of orderly growth can deal with the more difficult problems of an unsteady or decreasing state.

What are some of these issues? Most of them are familiar to you by this time. But it might be well worthwhile to review some of the more serious ones.

Projected Enrollments

The first is projected enrollments. There obviously are differences among states and differences among institutions. But some of the demographic facts are rather clear. Between 1980 and 1985 the traditional college age population will drop by 4.1 percent. In only about four states are modest increases in the age group expected. In some states the decrease between 1975 and 1985 will be closer to 25 percent. The number of high school graduates going on to college, particularly among males, has been dropping since 1968 and even the number of high school graduates in relation to total high school age population in the last few years has not increased.

While demographic facts alone do not determine enrollments, most of the less pessimistic enrollment projections count rather heavily on increased older and part-time students. If one includes both demographic and migration projections, only six states are expected to have modest increases in traditional freshmen between now and 1985.[1]

There may indeed be a good many older persons who would benefit from and welcome the opportunity for additional education, but even here the picture is not quite as clear as it is sometimes made out to be. Already the average college age is over the traditional college age figure. One out of every ten students is over the age of thirty-five. It just might be the case that many of the older students who want college courses and college credits are already there.

In 1976, for the first time in seventeen years, college enrollments dropped 1.2 percent. Community colleges that enroll the largest percentage of older students and which had increased 50 percent since 1970, dropped 2.2 percent. Most sur-

prisingly, students over thirty-five, who had increased 50 percent in the previous two years, did not increase. There may be a good many older people who are interested in education, but not in college courses or credits.

In the meantime, in the search by institutions for new clienteles, reinforced by growing public interest in lifelong learning, the area of adult, continuing education and lifelong learning has become a kind of competitive battleground for bodies. Some institutions are reaching across the country for additional older students, and others are establishing off-campus operations practically within other institutions. There are few areas today where effective planning to meet the needs of citizens is more acute than in adult, continuing education and lifelong learning.

Fiscal Issues

The second issue involves the fiscal situation. With recession and depression we already have experienced in many states a slowdown in the rate of increased funding in spite of inflation. In a few states there have been actual cutbacks. The fiscal situation is improving and the state income is increasing but there is little evidence that this will mean major increases in funding. Higher education no longer has the high priority it did in the sixties. Within higher education itself the student unrest of the late sixties and early seventies did not exactly inspire confidence. Recession and depression have increased state and taxpayer concern with frugality. Perhaps most important, the demands in other areas of public service—health, welfare, energy and conservation —have increased radically and state priorities have shifted to these.

Finally, where state surpluses are building up again taxpayer relief has moved to the top of the priority list. Even within education, while elementary-secondary education has already gone through enrollment declines, public concern with return to the basics, minimal competency and school district equalization plus the increased costs to the states of federal programs, including the new handicapped legislation, has tended to give elementary-secondary education a higher priority than higher education. Remember that there is no requirement that young people go to college.

Accountability

The third issue is the increased demand for accountability. This has and is taking at least three forms. The first is insistence upon more accurate, adequate and targeted information and the development of effective management information systems to supply it. The focus is not simply on quantity but on analysis, relevance and immediate availability.

The second form is what comes under the general rubric of performance audit. This includes not only fiscal audit but program audit, i.e., concern with outcomes, educational results and effectiveness. Some twenty states have developed their own legislative or gubernatorial version of the federal General Accounting Office. While these usually have not been set up specifically with higher education in mind, higher education or some form of it tends to be an early target, for, unlike many other agencies, higher education funds are not tied in most cases to mandatory formulas. This does raise critical questions about judgments of academic effectiveness, the criteria to be used and institutional and system academic integrity.

Since the demand will undoubtedly increase, the issue is not whether it will be done but whether it will be done internally to higher education by the state higher education agency, in cooperation with institutions, or by an external agency with primary concern for efficiency rather than educational effectiveness. The one thing that seems clear is that if the institutions and the state agency, in other words, the academic community, do not assume this responsibility, others are likely to do so (and in some cases already have).

The third form is increasing insistence on effective program review not only of new programs but of existing programs. The concern with and even demand for such program review is related to projected enrollments, the fiscal situation, presumed or actual duplication of programs and concern with maintaining quality in a period of

retrenchment. As already noted, in a majority of states the state agency authorizing legislation calls for review and/or approval of new and existing programs. In the period of expansion such review tended to be limited primarily to new programs.

Today both governmental pressure and institutional concern with maintaining quality in the face of retrenchment is making the issue progressively central. While continuous program review is or should be an ongoing institutional function, in relation to diversification, role and scope and effective utilization of resources, it also is a matter of statewide concern.

Scope

A fourth issue is the growing state concern with other sectors of postsecondary education in addition to public higher education. While this was enhanced by the *1202* legislation even before 1972, some states were beginning to realize that one could not plan effectively for public higher education without taking the range of postsecondary education—independent, proprietary and vocational institutions—into account. All of these constitute important parts of the states' postsecondary education resources.

State concern with the independent sector in particular has become increasingly important. Not only is there concern that the independent sector needs to be included in the planning process but forty-three states now make some form of direct or indirect aid available to them. Just what their continued role will be in the unsteady state, how the values they represent can be preserved without weakening the state's primary responsibility to public institutions and how destructive forms of competition can be avoided are major issues in a number of states.

Collective Bargaining

A fifth issue is the impact of collective bargaining. What its full impact will be, not only on individual campuses but on statewide coordinating and governing systems, is not yet clear. While it is not yet a national phenomenon it is becoming so. Not only has it affected intra-institutional modes of operation but in some states, for example New York, it has led to negotiations not with local or system administrators but with the governor's office directly.

What role collective bargaining will play in the unsteady state still is to be determined. Will it increase or inhibit institutional flexibility in meeting changed conditions? Will it tend to reinforce greater centralization, not necessarily through coordination and planning, but through centralization of the bargaining process? What impact will it have when retrenchment, program review, consolidation and performance audit come more fully into play?

Federal Legislation

A sixth factor is the growing impact of federal legislation and its regulations on statewide postsecondary educational activity. This is nothing new except in terms of scope. Three aspects call for mention. One is the increasing demand upon institutions and state agencies growing out of legislation not primarily aimed at higher education, such as civil rights, affirmative action, handicapped and occupational safety. These have statewide financial, planning and administrative as well as individual institutional implications.

The second is specific demands upon institutions growing out of eligibility for federal funds such as prescribed information for students, financial disclosure and fiscal probity. The third is the range of federal programs that call for statewide plans and add new responsibilities for state agencies. These are not necessarily integrated on the federal level but somehow must be integrated on the state level if we are not to end up with multiple and conflicting agencies on the state level reflecting multiple federal plans. These do require additional staff. It is critically important that state and federal programs be looked at and planned for in relation to each other.

Legislative and Executive Expectations

A seventh factor, which comes out of the other six, is concomitant with them and to some extent also underlies them, is what might be described

more broadly as changing legislative and executive expectations. It is present in the fiscal situation and is exemplified in accountability and particularly in concern with performance audit and program review. It might be considered a further elaboration of accountability or as a reaction to what has been perceived, whether correctly or not, as lack of accountability. It might also be described as a demand for greater responsibility through further centralization and control.

It reflects a feeling that coordinating and even some governing boards are too weak or unwilling to exercise their responsibilities of keeping institutions in line, that institutions have not been willing to cooperate effectively with such boards and continue to engage in end runs and that the only way that responsibility can be fixed and the hard realities of today dealt with is either by establishing a strong single governing board or a highly regulatory coordinating board that can control the system and make the hard decisions necessary. While this may seem an overly simplistic answer, not only is it a real alternative, it is one that appeals to many government officials and addresses some of the problems.

However, beyond this there is a further step or alternative. There is developing in some states a tendency to move responsibility for higher and postsecondary education decisions directly into the executive and/or legislative branches of state government. With the growth of executive and legislative staffs, where institutions do not work effectively with coordinating agencies and governing boards or where there is a concern that a single governing board would create a consolidated protagonist, it is always possible for executive and/or legislative branches of government to take over directly the major functions of budget review, audit contol and decision making for higher and postsecondary education. This appears to be happening in some states today.

These do not exhaust the issues by any means but they seem to be among the most persistent and pressing and are likely to grow in importance in the next few years.

---

1. Cathy Henderson, *Changes in Enrollment by 1985* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1977), p. 16.

Economic Realities

by Carol Van Alstyne

Economic conditions shape the environment in which states will be establishing their role in planning, coordination and governance of postsecondary education. I have been asked to characterize some of these conditions and to discuss their implications for these functions.

Inflation

The major economic concern facing higher education is inflation. For years, higher education price indexes have registered larger increases than have general measures of inflation. In previous periods, the faculty were blamed for this situation on the grounds that faculty salaries account for a major share of college budgets and that faculty pay increases were greater than cost-of-living increases. But in the last few years faculty have lost purchasing power relative to both the cost of living and the wages of workers in other sectors of the economy. Though inflation persists in higher education, it is no longer driven by faculty increases. In fact, faculty are now bearing much of the brunt of the adjustment to inflation in the other components of the budget.

Given the decline in their real income in recent years, will the faculty have sufficient bargaining power to make up for their losses, or must they accept the relative erosion of their economic status? In many institutions, larger cost-of-living adjustments have been given to lower-paid than to higher-paid employees, thus compressing salary ranges. Now, however, as institutions are pressed to meet competitive salary offers, higher-paid people will probably get more attention. Generally, it does not look as if the faculty will be the source of persistently higher inflation in higher education.

On the other hand, costs will probably continue to rise in other areas, including energy, equipment and books. To find out why inflation has been higher in education than in the rest of the economy, the American Council on Education conducted a study in 1976 that covered twelve federally mandated social programs ranging from age discrimination and affirmative action to occupational safety and health.

The results showed that the implementation of these programs is one source of added costs which academic institutions, as nonprofit organizations, cannot easily pass along. Indeed, these costs had doubled over the previous five years, growing considerably faster than the cost of instruction. These program costs are not expected to taper off soon.

Enrollments

A second major economic concern for higher education involves trends in enrollments and in tuition revenues. It is generally expected that college enrollment will decline in the 1980s. Given the comparatively large base of fixed costs that colleges have in providing educational services, enrollment declines mean that student tuition will rise even faster than inflation in higher education (which is, remember, higher than the economy as a whole).

We should not, however, accept the projected enrollment declines as established fact that renders needless any further analysis. In the first place,

---

Carol Van Alstyne is Chief Economist for the American Council on Education.

some of the "doom-and-gloom" projections of enrollment declines are based on simulations or models of how our economic system works and how the education sector is related to the overall economy, and these models yield answers that depend on the assumptions fed to them. Simulation techniques are designed to show how the computed results differ, depending on differences in the data and assumptions used. Some of the "doom-and-gloom" specialists have, inappropriately, used simulation techniques as if they were deterministic—that is, as if the model produces a single answer that is derived inexorably from the demographic statistics.

But different assumptions produce different answers. Careful analysis should focus on the assumptions. In this country, enrollments at the elementary and secondary levels are closely tied to population. They are demographically driven because of the extremely high proportion of all those within the school-age cohort who go to school. But in most states, only 25-50 percent of the college-age cohort are actually enrolled in college. (California has the highest college-going rate, with close to 58 percent in 1975. The national average is about 40 percent.)

In reality, college enrollments depend on economics and politics as well as demographics. The economic and political variables that intervene between the population and the enrollment must be taken into consideration in estimating future levels. In recognition of these, planning for higher education can move from an environment of absolute constraint to one of relative choice, and the connection between planning and action can be changed from passive administrative response to active policy initiatives.

Further, population trends in the different states vary markedly above and below the national average and that has to be taken into account by planners estimating future college enrollment within the individual states.

A lot of editorial implications about how the public values higher education have been drawn from apparent declines in college-going rates, which peaked about 1969. (Even though they have begun to rise again in the most recent years, they have not reached the levels of a decade ago.) One explanation offered for the decline is that, in the late sixties, young men enrolled in college to avoid the draft, but after the country switched to an all-volunteer army that reason no longer existed.

What this explanation overlooks, however, is that the Census Bureau, which generates these education statistics, uses the civilian population base in calculating education participation rates. This means that as the number of people in the military declines, those formerly in the service are moved into the civilian population base. With a given number of people in the population of the country, and a given number of people enrolled in college, then a decrease in the military population results in an increase in the civilian population, which in turn increases the population base on which education participation rates are calculated. The final result is a decrease in the rates. To some extent, then, recent apparent declines in education participation rates are statistical artifacts.

In addition, year-to-year fluctuations in total enrollment are closely related to year-to-year fluctuations in the number of students receiving veterans' benefits. If this source of short-term fluctuation is separated out of the enrollment data to derive a better estimate of the underlying trend from 1970 to the present, one finds an increase in the enrollment of students going to college without GI benefits.

New Clientele

The eighteen-to twenty-four-year-old cohort will decline in coming years. But fewer than half of the students currently enrolled in college are "college age." With that realization, colleges and universities are paying greater attention to the adult students they have, and are actively seeking ways to attract more.

But those institutions facing the sharpest enrollment declines are not necessarily those best located, in urban centers, to attract larger numbers of adults, most of whom work full-time and go to school part-time. Questions are being raised about

whether the adult college-going rates can indeed be increased by very much.

In any case, adult enrollments are highly changeable from year to year, being more affected by cyclical economic conditions such as unemployment than are enrollments of younger students. The year 1976 was one of comparatively little growth in overall college enrollments, largely because the recent trend toward increased adult participation flattened out. But this is probably not the beginning of a long-term declining trend, but rather a short-term response to cyclical fluctuations in overall economic activity.

The volatility of adult enrollments from year to year is one of the many reasons why those who plan for higher education should pay more attention to the relationships between this sector and the economy as a whole, so that they will become more aware specifically of the impact of trends *and cycles* in overall economic activity on revenues and expenditures. I think a major flaw in much economic analysis of higher education is to project the current conditions, whatever they are, into the long-term future, without paying enough attention to where we are in the business cycle.

Access

In judging recent progress toward the national goal of equal educational opportunity, the standard of performance has been framed in terms of education participation rates: that is, the proportion of a particular group - identified by such characteristics as race, sex, and income - who are enrolled in college. The concept of equal opportunity in education has now been broadened beyond just access to include choice among different institutions. And disadvantaged groups are pressing for still further expansion of the fundamental concept of equality to embrace greater equality of educational outcomes.

Currently, however, the government is attempting to move in another direction by redefining equality of access in narrow economic terms, using a concept of "net price." Proponents of this measure start with the cost of an educational option and subtract financial aid to the student (including support from parents) to arrive at a calculation of net price to the student. "Equal net price" to students, across the range of family incomes and across the range of different college costs is then defined as "equal educational opportunity."

But this attempt to redefine access in terms of net price poses great dangers. It is possible to have equal net prices to students and still to have actual college-going rates for the rich students three times higher than for the poor students. The introduction of the "net price" concept is a move to redefine equality rather than to achieve it.

Tuition Tax Credits

The various tuition tax credit proposals considered by Congress over the years have generally been viewed by the higher education community as being bad ideas. They are regarded as neither equitable (since they are not directed to those most in need of financial aid) nor efficient (since they would not change the decision to go to college). In sum, they have been characterized as a rather ineffective way of allocating public resources to higher education. Thus, when asked to review proposals by those formulating them in Congress the higher education community has almost uniformly rejected them.

The academic community also feared that the federal revenue lost through tuition tax credits would be made up by cutting direct student aid in the federal budget. The result would be the same number of dollars flowing to higher education, but with more in the form of nontargeted tuition tax credits, and less in the form of targeted student aid.

But budget outlays for student aid programs are considered by one set of congressional committees and tax credits by another set. Even with the new congressional budget process, the two forms of aid may not be traded off against each other, particularly if the tax credit measure is seen in part at least as a form of middle-income tax relief rather than just as student aid.

There is tremendous congressional interest in creating these tax credits and forcing them on the higher education community. Many educators are opposed in principle to the use of the tax credit or tax deduction mechanisms in public finance, preferring the public accountability of direct budget outlays. But given the fact that they are used in the world of second best, they can be as justified for investing in education as they can for drilling oil wells or for borrowing money to buy houses.

Veterans' Benefits

In 1976, four years after the introduction of the massive new program of Basic Grants, veterans' benefits still constituted a larger share of total federal funds available to students then they did in 1972. The reasons were that: awards under veterans' benefits were larger than the awards under the Basic Grants program; a large number of people received them; and they were full entitlements, which Basic Grants still are not, being subject legally to annual budget authorizations.

The flow of total benefits will decline, however, as people use up their eligibility, as the number in military service decreases and as the military converts their educational benefits largely to in-service programs. The $4 billion of veterans' benefits in 1976 will sink to $3 billion, $2 billion, or even less. More attention should be paid at the state level to the impact, which varies considerably by state, of that withdrawal of indirect federal financial support for higher education.

Social Security

Another economic concern for higher education institutions is Social Security contributions, which are, in effect, taxes on employment. Up until about two years ago, this was not even included in the domain of issues that concerned higher education, much less was it thought to be a matter that something could be done about.

Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that, because higher education is highly labor intensive, a relative shift of federal revenue sources from income taxes to employment taxes erodes the benefits of the tax-exempt status of higher education institutions. Even though they are exempt from income taxes, they are not exempt from employment taxes, which they cannot shift, at least in the short run as conventional theory holds, to the employee. Since 1960, employment-based taxes have increased from less than one-sixth to almost one-third of the federal budget receipts.

Regulation

Because market mechanisms and voluntary actions have failed to advance adequately goals of social justice or to protect the environment, the government relies more and more heavily on regulation, which varies in effectiveness. Nonetheless, if regulation is good for the rest of the country, it is good for higher education as well. In trying to deflect the effects of federally mandated programs, some have argued that higher education is different from the other employers or federal contractors subject to the laws. But such an argument is politically costly. Rather, the claims of higher education for special attention must be based on the difficulties that nonprofit organizations have in covering the added costs of implementing federally mandated programs.

For instance, modifying facilities and equipment to meet the requirements of the new regulations related to the handicapped can increase both capital and operating costs. But academic institutions have no added revenues to pay for these added costs.

To take another example: colleges and universities fear the cost consequences of raising the mandatory retirement age if older, higher-salaried staff members cannot be replaced for another five years with younger and lower-salaried staff members. But preliminary data on the age distribution of academic employees indicate that very few are currently near the age where this regulation is going to make a difference in their decision to retire. There are, however, a large proportion of staff in the forty-five- to fifty-year-old age group. The real impact of the change in the retirement age will not be felt for another ten to fifteen years; there is, consequently, time to prepare for it.

Some additional implications of these economic realities for statewide planning, coordination, and governance can also be identified.

Budgeting

When all the trends were up, simple formula funding based on enrollments was adequate for estimating budget requirements. But now, as is widely recognized, more complex funding formulas are needed, based on better analyses of the ways costs are affected by changing levels of enrollment, both up and down.

For some types of program functions, for instance, head count may be a more reasonable basis for funding than full-time-equivalent enrollment.

But a more significant shift may be away from enrollment-driven funding formulas altogether, to entirely new bases of budgeting financial support, more firmly grounded in cost data by function and by object, adjusted for anticipated inflation with more refined price indexes for higher education. Such a shift will lead to much more rigorous requirements for identifying those costs and to the development of a whole new set of analytic techniques which yield marginal costs rather than average costs. Still more effort will be necessary to relate these costs to program quality and program diversity.

Capital Requirements

Next to inflation of operating costs, meeting the capital requirements of higher education may be the topmost financial concern facing higher education in the 1980s. Capital is needed to rebuild endowments not yet recovered from earlier decimation because of poor stock market performance and now eroded by inflation; to renew structures undermaintained for the last five to ten years; and to implement regulatory requirements that involve major modifications of older plant and equipment to meet newly mandated standards.

Recently, with projections for an eased national economic situation in the near term, a burgeoning number of colleges—both in the private sector and increasingly in the public—are planning capital fund drives. Many more dollars are expected to be generated from these capital fund drives planned in the next two years than from those completed in the last two. But with the aggregate plans for drives increasing sharply, growth of the funding goals may exceed the growth in the support available from the traditional sources of support. Under these conditions, all the plans cannot be carried out.

Improving Measures of Financial Conditions

State planners and coordinators need better analyses of the financial conditions of the institutions within their states. A vast amount of new work to improve the tools of analysis is now producing results which can be further tested and refined through careful use. Scanning income statements to identify current operating surpluses and deficits is now recognized as an inadequate measure of longer-run financial equilibrium, which requires that not only the budget balance but also the trend in future revenues be adequate to cover the trend in future expenditures.

In addition, greater attention to balance sheets and assessment of trends in net worth will be helpful in evaluating the adequacy of the capital base and future needs for capital. Because most fund accounts for higher education institutions do not include depreciation, and because plant fund reserves are often inadequate for replacement, it is likely to be of special importance that those concerned with financial planning and coordination take a close look at the capital side of the financial requirements of the higher education institutions in their jurisdiction.

Maintenance-of-Effort Standards

A major concern in government programs of support for higher education is the extent to which federal funds merely substitute for state funds, or state funds substitute for institutional funds, rather than providing additional assistance as intended by the legislation enacted. State planners and coordinators share an interest in the development and implementation of maintenance-of-effort standards or conditions for public funding. These standards may be derived in terms of dollars of support per student, adjusted for infla-

tion in order to judge the real net effect of additional program funds.

Institutions in the public sector stridently object to increased support for private institutions if they regard that support as having been taken out of their budgets. A full maintenance-of-effort standard applied to state support of public institutions would probably recognize the need for funding quality improvement in the public sector in establishing the criteria for judging whether state support for private institutions was taken away from the public sector.

State and Federal Roles

An historic concern in our federal system is the delineation of the separate and the overlapping responsibilities of the state government in financing higher education institutions and the federal government in redistributive programs to create greater access and choice for students. The impact of federal need-based student aid on state tuition levels and on state student aid programs is a much debated question. Planners at the state level may find that need-based Basic Grants are causing the states to raise their tuition levels—thus increasing student need, which in turn increases federal student aid—as a way of shifting more of the financing from the state to the federal level.

Other actions, both within and outside the domain of higher education, also affect the division of public support for higher education between the state and the federal levels of government. The effects stemming from legislation on intergovernmental shifts in these financial flows should be the object of much more careful analysis on the part of state planners and budgeters. Does an increase in Social Security employer contributions, which increases employment costs at many state institutions, tend marginally to shift a greater share of the financing to state appropriations? Or, in the other direction, would a tuition tax credit permit states to raise tuitions at the public institutions which would be paid by families and credited against their federal income tax, so that through foregone revenues, one effect would be a shift of financing shares more toward the federal government?

Legislative Cycles

Congress is currently operating on a four-year cycle of legislative authorization of support for higher education. An expanded federal role was set out in legislation enacted in 1972 and reauthorized in 1976 for another four years. This puts 1978 in the middle of the legislative cycle. It can be easily anticipated that educational subcommittees will direct their attention toward legislative oversight and program effectiveness. They are very likely to be looking at such matters as abuses of student aid programs and the costs of administering them. In preparation for that program review, the states and institutions could start making sure that their houses are in order. Ideas for changes in the programs should be worked out and presented in 1979 in anticipation of debates on new education legislation in 1980.

Research Funding

In the late sixties, at the peak of federal support for research, every institutional dollar invested in research attracted four to five additional federal dollars. In recent years, the institutional research dollar has been matched by only two to three federal dollars. The result of this significant shift is that an increasing share of total investment in research performed in colleges and universities is funded by the institutions themselves. Planners at the state level should be aware of this structural shift in the financing of research because it affects institutional activities, staffing, expenditures and revenues.

State Financing of National Benefits

Beyond educating people, colleges and universities perform activities which produce very significant social benefits. These activities range from performing basic research to delivering health care. Greater educational opportunity is promoted by the nearly $500 million of student aid funded by the institutions themselves. Those making decisions about state plans and budgets need to think very carefully about the proper balance of support when they are asked to invest state funds in higher education activities that benefit not just the state but the nation.

Accountability

by Robert Berdahl

It is quite remarkable that when the states began to create state higher education institutions, they did not turn to the normal forms of accountability for running them. Instead, they accepted the precedent of the private college board of trustees with its corporate form of government. Earl Cheit has called this a self-denying ordinance whereby the state gave to the corporate boards established for public colleges certain privileges and immunities not granted to other state activities: the right to sue and be sued, to have control over their internal finances, to handle personnel policies free of state civil service rules and so on.

Over time, pressures for increased accountability have lessened the areas of discretion those corporate boards have enjoyed (particularly in areas like budgets or determination of new buildings); items such as program control, admission of particular students, and the hiring, promotion and tenure of particular faculty members have always been off-limits or beyond the reach of state accountability. Although the self-denying ordinance has thus been modified with the emergence of statewide boards, executive and legislative staffs, PPBS, cost benefit analysis and better information systems, until recently the heart of academe had remained beyond the reach.

Lately, however, there have been some general developments in state government which may operate ultimately to alter the exemptions from traditional state accountability patterns. In the executive branch of state government, for instance, many states changed two-year gubernatorial terms to four years. Many states also removed the prohibition against reelection of their governor and gave the governor item veto powers so that he or she could reach inside the budget and literally blue pencil individual items and leave the rest of the bill intact.

Occasionally states also reorganized some of their floating multimember commissions with staggered terms in order to bring them more closely under the control of a single governor during his administration. Many states put statewide elective offices like attorney general, secretary of state, lieutenant governor on a ticket together or made some of them appointive by the elected governor to strengthen the coherence of the executive branch.

While all of that was going on, state legislatures were not remaining passive in the face of this strengthening of the executive branch. They improved their staffing and fought for control of the postaudit function. In the past twenty years, the postaudit function in over thirty-five states has been brought into the legislative branch and its activities often broadened in scope and nature to go beyond the traditional fiscal and management audits wherein legality and efficiency of expenditures were examined. The broadened activities have moved to something called performance or program audits in which the effectiveness rather than the efficiency of the object is examined. Now, it sounds easy to judge whether an activity is effective or not. But this implies that somebody has an idea somewhere as to what ought to be, in normative terms, the output of the agency or function in question.

The state audit staffs, many of whom are very bright young men and women coming out of

---

Robert Berdahl is Professor of Higher Education at the State University of New York in Buffalo.

graduate schools of public policy at flagship campuses, join the ranks of the legislative staff at the state capital and come back to their alma mater in a mood to bite the hand that intellectually fed them. They ask some very awkward questions and those in higher education do not seem very ready or able to offer answers.

There has emerged in the past few years a movement called the Legislative Program Evaluation (LPE). Rutgers has a clearinghouse for the organization at the Eagleton Institute of Politics, and the National Conference on State Legislatures in Denver is used for administrative coordination. The LPE staff wants to know the answers to some very stark questions: What are your purposes? How do they jibe with legislative intent? To what extent is your agency doing what the legislature meant for you to do? How good is it? Could it be improved?

Wherever it is and under whatever forms it takes, LPE is coming, and it is no longer granting exemption and immunity to higher education. Institutions can not tell them to go away simply because the heart of academe has always been deferred to by the state accountability pattern. Case studies indicate that these staffs are not deferring to the professionals in education any longer but are demanding the same accountability expected from highways, prisons, agriculture, recreation and everybody else. The plea that higher education is different because of notions of academic freedom or academic institutional autonomy just does not seem to go very far.

Most states are now using LPE studies to undertake relatively technical pieces of analysis. There are not many states that yet seem ready to aim that performance audit weapon at academic programs on the four-year campuses. For the moment, there is a holding pattern where academic programs in most states have not yet been evaluated by the LPE staff. But one senses that it is an uneasy plateau period.

Alongside is coming another movement, sunset legislation, that lends reason to fear that it may join with LPE and together become an irresistible force. In contrast to the assumption that any state agency continues unless it is explicitly terminated, sunset legislation means that all state agencies will be terminated unless explicitly continued. Legislators build in a timetable for the review and evaluation of the effectiveness of the agencies concerned.

There are three kinds of sunset laws. Some apply only to regulatory boards like boards of cosmetology or barbers. There are also selective laws that go beyond the regulatory function but stop short of being comprehensive. In the third category are the comprehensive laws that say that every state agency between now and 1982 will be lined up in a certain sequence and will be evaluated and either continued or terminated. One does not know what kinds of state staffs will try to make these terminal judgments or what kinds of criteria they will use as to whether the higher education agencies are "effective" or not.

The Legislative Program Evaluation movement and sunset legislation lead one to believe that the people in the state capitol are no longer going to be content merely to evaluate inputs: how many students, how many faculty, how many square feet of buildings and how many dollars. Evaluators will come around to the exit door and will ask how good institutions are at what they are doing. This trend is reinforced by the demand for minimum competency in elementary-secondary education. The day may come when the same stringent review will be applied to higher education.

I would say that those in higher education have about ten years to decide this kind of policy dilemma of whether to cooperate with the "technocrats" in devising systems of evaluation of output and maybe let them come more quickly or to stand in the door and tell them to go away since output evaluation is not appropriate to what is going on in higher education. Do we cooperate with these elements in state government and try to make jointly a set of criteria that institutions can live with and that do minimum damage to what are considered to be academic values?

The patterns of accountability in the future will have to be much more concerned with the forms of evaluation. Statewide boards are now doing quite well at the program level, particularly in the

approval of new programs. Statewide boards are also getting more thoroughly into a review of existing programs which, of course, is much more controversial. But whether they will go beyond that and will start trying to evaluate the outputs of higher education is very problematical. If a statewide board does not try to help the institution to be its better self in the face of this outside demand for performance accountability, I think the task will go by default to people, perhaps of goodwill and benign intent, who will make their own systems of accountability, and academe may have to live in a straitjacket that is not one of its own making.

Legislative Role

by H. A. "Barney" Goltz

The legislature is changing from a part-time to a full-time kind of body, and legislators are different now. In many cases they are younger than they have been in the past. They are voting themselves higher salaries and are undergoing a greater turnover, and they come from an open government background. Many of the legislators now being elected to office came out of the period of unrest in the higher education institutions. In a sense, the legislative process itself has become politicized in terms of decision making regarding higher education.

It is not possible any more for any single legislator to bring back a college to his district. Rather, the process goes from an individual effort to a widespread effort of systems, formulas and staff. Greatly increased legislative staffs, computers and other kinds of resources make it possible for the legislature to be a coequal with the executive branch of government. Legislative staffs are, in some respects, becoming a force of their own.

Sometimes it is difficult to make a distinction between a staff responsibility and a staff's becoming policy makers in its own right, because when the legislators go home, the legislative staff remains behind with the staff of coordinating councils and with the governor's staff from the executive budget office. If the legislature, for example, gives the mandate to the legislative staff to study the issue of student tuition and if there may be a resolution from the Council for Postsecondary Education to study student tuition while the governor's staff is studying student tuition, the best way to resolve the policy issue should be to have different points of view clash in an environment of goodwill between the legislative and executive branches. Instead of that, one finds that the political process has occurred while the legislators are back home. Out of the three separate, independent views of student tuition comes one recommendation because the staffs meet one another, work together and develop staff comraderie.

Another issue is the growing strength of the student lobbying effort. They are committing resources of their own, and they are interested in consumer legislation. There may be an education malpractice suit brought against institutions and the legislature for failure to meet the commitments which apparently were made through catalogs and other things.

Finally, there is a concern by the state legislature to be more responsive to what the public thinks higher education should be doing rather than to what the institutions have been saying that they should be doing. For example, there is more interest in vocational education. I think that the legislature is increasingly concerned about the cost of programs and is trying to stretch the tax dollar by looking for unnecessary programs. Legislatures are accusing some of the institutions of creating demand in order to maintain full-time-equivalent formulas and faculty positions. They are concerned about duplication.

State Senator H.A. "Barney" Goltz is Chairman of the Higher Education Committee for the State of Washington.

Collective Bargaining

by James Rosser

Collective bargaining has severely changed the nature of the collegial governance system that has existed in many higher education institutions and even in some state systems. There also has emerged a series of external agencies that have placed their stamp on the internal management and administration of institutions of higher learning. These are public employee relations types of commissions which play a very prominent role in defining a whole range of questions relating to what formerly were defined as faculty rights, privileges and prerogatives and what are now being coined as terms and conditions of employment.

There is a change in terms of the nature of grievance procedures. Court decisions are beginning to have an impact on due process and on redefining a variety of factors relating to what academic freedom may have been considered in the past. Unions typically have placed a primary emphasis on employment security. An additional problem that higher education is beginning to face is defining the position of students as consumers of educational services in relationship to collective bargaining. Institutions are seeing a much more active students' role in initial appointments, reappointments and tenure decisions. There is a growing advocacy as they become concerned when enrollments get tight.

An additional problem relates to retrenchment and collective bargaining. The introduction of reduction-in-force clauses in contracts has been determined to be a negotiable item, at least as relates to impact. An additional item of interest pertains to the fact that the negotiated contract with the New Jersey state college faculty union (AFT), gives the union leader the right to speak on any matter at any Board of Higher Education meeting. In the area of affirmative action, unions are still concerned primarily with job security as well as with terms and conditions; there is a seniority principle that still exists. So institutions find themselves in a very difficult position vis-a-vis reduction-in-force clauses and affirmative action policies.

An escalation has occurred in the number of administrators required, in effect, to interact with organized faculty units. There has been an overburdening of the normal grievance procedures within an institution with appeals all the way up the line. And court cases or even grievance decisions are made which go against the institution, not on the basis of principle but by virtue of the fact of incomplete data and available information.

College presidents and boards of trustees probably have been a little slow in developing a concept of what their role is in the bargaining process as they move to the bargaining table. Professional labor negotiators on the union side have come in to negotiate with individuals who were novices. At the outset, management gave up a great deal more than was necessary in preserving some of its prerogatives.

As management looks to the 1980s and confronts the issue of how to meet changing needs and new demands, it must be sensitive to the fact that collective bargaining can be an impediment. Much like statewide coordination, collective bargaining has become a permanent feature of higher education. Management must learn to live with collective bargaining and must devote a great deal of creative energy and intellect to it in order to be able to be responsible as well as responsive.

James Rosser is Vice Chancellor of the New Jersey State Board of Higher Education.

Dialogue

Excerpts from the Discussions

Legislative Role

One of the real beneficial roles of a coordinating board is that it serves as the memory for the legislature.

Some people seem to think that model legislation is such that every state will or should adopt it as is, but this is basically wrong. The function of model legislation is to suggest the problem and a possible answer. It has to be adapted in light of the particular history and needs of the state.

The legislature will support coordinating agencies as long as the legislature retains the right to make the final decisions and to set the policies. A trend toward centralized boards is doubtful, because the bureaucracy created under centralized boards is repugnant to a legislator.

Evaluation

The tendency to relate accountability to the program level is entirely the wrong level for states and institutions to be focusing on. A statement of institutional objectives encompasses program objectives, and the development of accountability systems should be within the context of an institution's ability to articulate the manner in which it pursues its overall objectives. The state's allotment of educational tasks is at the missions level, so a distinction should be made between the kind of educational tasks that are allotted to an institution or to a particular kind of institution. There are other ways, then, of seeing that those assignments of function can be evaluated other than by legislative designation.

Those in education have to find some ways of regaining credibility based on good solid information, on an objective presentation of conditions and with an attempt to keep the state's concern legitimate.

Some of the burden of responsibility as it relates to accountability has to and can be entrusted to faculty and administrators at the institutional level.

An understanding of the purpose for which program or institutional evaluation is carried out is necessary in order to construct an evaluation design. Is it the intention of the legislative program audit to reduce the costs of education? Is the purpose to find out whether or not the program was a good idea but failed to meet intended objectives? Is the purpose partly diagnostic? There are many reasons for evaluations but unless these are made explicit in the beginning, the evaluation is likely to miss its intent.

Fragmentation

There are unintended, unplanned consequences of social politics. When more people are involved in decision-making arenas than ever before, sometimes the voices become shrill and come from unexpected places and corners.

Almost all groups in higher education feel as if they have lost power, including faculty, presidents and students. Where did it go? This is really a problem of new structures and of trying to share that power in different ways and with different styles of leadership.

The federal government should be encouraged to stop being a catalyst for fragmentation. Part of the problem is the lack of a well-defined and articulated role for the federal government in terms of the impact that it has on the states.

The fragmentation and pluralism imposed on political systems both at the federal and the state level is a terrible burden. On the other hand, there is a certain spillover benefit to freedom and autonomy from having fragmentation and not one coherent federal policy. The problem is not whether to encourage fragmentation or to funnel the money through one channel; rather, it is to develop a system where there at least is a reasonable exchange of information.

What Do We Do in the Future?

Introduction

by Richard M. Millard

The basic question is where do we go from here? Are current boards adequate to deal with the new issues, with the problems of the unsteady state? What new roles can and should coordinating and governing boards play? How can or should they be strengthened? What are the alternatives? How do we preserve a degree of independence of institutions essential to imaginatively carrying out their functions? Are we inevitably heading towards ever greater centralization and regulation?

My crystal ball is as clouded as the next person's, but it seems to me that some things are rather clear. The first is that returning to no coordination or to wholly voluntary coordination are not real alternatives. Further, I strongly suspect that the days of purely advisory coordination, Clark Kerr to the contrary, are limited. Given the nature of the issues, the increasing competition for students and the necessity at some points for hard decisions, boards, without some implementing powers in addition to persuasion, are likely, as are the institutions under their purview, to be in serious trouble.

Second, it is not possible or desirable to try to speculate on what the best or most feasible form of coordination in all the states should be. Again, each of the states is different. The seriousness of the issues vary from state to state and take somewhat different forms in each state. In a very few states even enrollments are not a serious problem.

The forms of coordination will and should vary with the needs, conditions and histories of the states. Some boards have been far more effective in their states than others have been in theirs. In terms of adequacy of present boards some undoubtedly will have to be strengthened. Some states will in all likelihood move to consolidated governing boards. But how far and in which direction they move will have to be determined in the individual states.

Third, it does seem rather clear at this point that preserving or enhancing institutional independence to operate effectively within role and scope and in the face of increased demands for accountability and outcomes depends far more directly than ever before upon institutional support for and involvement in statewide planning and coordination. The alternative is to return not to institutional laissez-faire but to direct political intervention.

Board Responsibilities

Despite the uniqueness of solutions to particular states, there are, however, certain responsibilities

and activities that institutions and coordinating or governing boards are going to need to consider as far more urgent and critical than in the past. Among these would seem to be the following.

The first is to recognize that statewide planning is even more essential today than in the period of expansion but that its emphasis has and must shift in most states to the more difficult task of planning for steady or decreasing enrollments and retrenchment.

The second is to recognize that the total postsecondary educational resources of the state must be taken into account in the planning process—public, private and proprietary—and that no system can or should be penalized at the expense of the others if resources are to be utilized effectively to meet the educational needs of students.

Third, far more attention will have to be given to relating expenditures to outcomes, to performance audit.

Fourth, the nature of the budgeting process will need to be thoroughly reviewed and formulas reexamined in terms of their adequacy to deal with problems of contraction.

Fifth, while it is not the function of coordinating or governing boards or institutions to set other state priorities, such agencies should not only be aware of these other priorities but of the ways in which these relate to higher education.

Sixth, of particular importance now is attention to statewide and even regional planning for adult, continuing education and lifelong learning.

Finally, and fundamentally, it is of basic importance that the lines of communication between coordinating and/or governing boards not only with institutions but with legislative and executive branches of state government be kept open. Recognizing the importance of this is not to politicize higher or postsecondary education but to enable legislators, governors, state higher or postsecondary education agencies and institutions to work more effectively with each other to meet the critical problems ahead. Only if this occurs can the confidence essential to effective operations be built.

Conclusion

Statewide coordination and/or governance is here to stay. The problems and issues will make the period ahead less than easy for institutions, state coordinating or governing agencies and for state government related to postsecondary education. State boards and agencies must have both the powers and the resources including staff to carry out their functions effectively. They will need the support and cooperation of the institutions under their purview.

The stakes, in their effectiveness and success for institutions, for higher education, for students and for the future of education in this country, are extraordinarily high. This is a time for nonparochial leadership and cooperation. The alternatives may well be either the politicization of higher education or the development of something much closer to ministries of education under which the tradition of institutional independence may all but disappear.

Program Evaluation

by Thurston E. Manning

Evaluation of quality of institutions or programs is in most states a responsibility of individual institutions acting alone or through the voluntary accreditation process. A fundamental point is that judgment about quality must be based on an understanding of purpose: unless one is sure what purpose an institution or program is to serve one cannot judge whether it is achieving the purpose. And the degree of success in achieving educational purpose is the measure of educational quality.

Evaluation itself can serve different ends, and the form of evaluation must be chosen with this in mind. Among the ends of evaluation are judgments about *(a)* the effectiveness of institutions or programs (that is, are they in fact achieving their purposes); *(b)* the efficiencies of institutions or programs (that is, are they achieving their purposes at reasonable cost); and *(c)* the improvement of institutional or program effectiveness or efficiency. The accreditation process has taken as a primary end the improvement of institutions and programs. As a result its procedures are different from those that would be used if a judgment of effectiveness or efficiency were the only outcome of the evaluation. Indeed, for many institutions the end of improvement is more important than the effectiveness judgment, and that judgment is therefore an incidental outcome.

The future concerns of states in assuring institutional and program quality require addressing several issues. First of these is the need for states to develop clearer statements of purpose for institutions, especially the public institutions. Institutional statements of purpose are often vague and almost theological in language. What is needed are statements sufficiently precise to gauge whether the activities of the institutions do achieve the purposes – the measure of institutional quality.

A second issue is the inherent conflict between central control of a system of institutions and the local autonomy of each institution. States need to find a middle ground that will allow for sufficient coherence of the system to assure statewide objectives, while permitting the flexibility that will permit institutions to respond to new local demands and engage in constructive innovation. A system that has too tight central control is inflexible and unresponsive; a system that is completely decentralized lacks coherence, tends to overlook statewide concerns, and frequently has unneeded duplications. The balance between the two extremes is a day-by-day political problem having solutions unique in each state.

The third issue is the need for states to have a broad base for making judgments about educational quality. Intrastate conflicts among institutions do exist and may affect judgments about institutions. Particularly serious is the situation in which the governing board of a public institution becomes the state licensing agency for private institutions. In such cases, a judgment restraining or prohibiting the operations of a private institution is often seen as arising from a fear of competition on the part of the licensing agency which is simultaneously an institution competing for students.

But perhaps a more important reason for a broad base of judgment is the fact that no state's educational system stands on its own. Consequently

---

Thurston E. Manning is Director of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

there is a need to look beyond the borders of a state, to be aware of the interstate effects of educational decisions and judgments, and to utilize knowledge and experience available beyond the state borders.

A possible way for states to obtain a broader base for judgments of educational quality of its institutions is to utilize more fully the activities of the voluntary accrediting associations. These organizations extend over several states, thus providing a geographical broadening, and in addition incorporate both public and private institutions. While accreditation currently focuses on individual institutions or programs (and thus does not deal directly with the state concern of coordination among institutions), it represents an accepted means by which judgments about the quality of those institutions and programs can be made.

Two final comments. First, while it is true that educational quality means the successful meeting of valid educational purposes, the states should be aware that their educational systems have other effects. From time to time a state should conduct what Scriven has called a "goal-free" evaluation: simply having qualified persons examine the effects of an institution or program without reference to the purposes. In this way important outcomes unrelated to stated purposes may be discovered.

Second, states — or more exactly the people of a state — should have some tolerance for the mistakes that will be made in any human enterprise. Public organizations often seem so intolerant of error that primary attention is given to error avoidance. But if the educational enterprise is to be flexible enough to meet the new and developing needs of society it must encourage trying new things. Some of these trials will not be successful; mistakes will occur. Never committing mistakes means never doing anything new and untried. The cost of mistakes is less than the cost of inaction.

Dialogue

Excerpts from the Discussions

Program Evaluation

Evaluation from the statewide perspective should insure that program development is not duplication, that the expenditures of monies are appropriate within the private and public sectors and that decisions are made with some objectivity. Regional accrediting is external and broadly based; however, it is a formative evaluation which does not ask for elimination but which emphasizes improvement. Because of this external quality there might be a problem in trying to reconcile regional accrediting and the different perspective of the statewide board that wants a broad-based, summative evaluation. For even if an institution is doing the job that its mission statement requires, it may be questionable whether all programs should be continued in their current mode.

Since many state agencies are becoming accrediting agencies within the state, the trick is to get the coordinating agency in the state and the regional accrediting agency together to work towards common purposes and towards an understanding of each other. There are, nevertheless, distinguishable functions and purposes between the two types of agencies and the distinctions have to be as carefully drawn as the similarities, which may involve the possible political issue of quality in this next period.

The reality of many conflicting patterns that now exist for institutional evaluation and accountability is that they are extremely time-consuming and that they often are not related to the institutional operation itself. Primarily, of course, it is essential to establish the basic mission of the institution.

Institutions need to determine the nature of their clientele and then to be accountable and responsive to the changing and shifting of programs as new fields emerge. Although the need for fiscal and program accountability at a statewide level and even beyond that level is generally accepted, it must first be recognized that reviews ought to be more regular.

Higher education is not past the point where it is possible by cooperative action to retain control over its destiny. It is at a point, though, where institutions are being seriously questioned about their function, methods and products and the relationship among them as well as their ability to effectively use resources of the state.

Retrenchment

Most institutions recognize that enrollments are probably going to go down. But almost every institution thinks it will happen someplace else.

Planning for enrollment decline is a statewide planning and management problem. The state legislatures, the coordinating councils and the individual institutions should take a rather broad view of the total higher educational enterprise in the state as being dependent upon the success of each of the component parts. Although demographers have demonstrated that the ability to project long-term enrollments, either statewide or institution-by-institution, have proven to be very faulty, short-term projections have been remark-

ably successful. The need is for a long-term policy with short-term management objectives in order to manage the planning for enrollment declines and the appropriation reductions which follow.

In some states, legislators strongly suspect that all of the concern about lifelong learning is a dodge to try to fill the empty classrooms in traditional institutions.

Probably the best method in handling enrollment is the so-called contracted enrollment, an agreed-upon figure of the number of students for each jurisdiction, which is where the ultimate board authority lies. When these contracted enrollments are made, there has to be some kind of a determination agreed upon by the institutions. The coordinating council can go a long way toward negotiating and evaluating the estimates. Also, the legislature has a right to expect that if the contracts are not kept, there will be some sort of penalty upon the institutions. The reversion of the funds which come from overenrollment is based on the idea that institutions will not start overrecruiting in order to build up the enrollments.

Once the contracted enrollment level is achieved, the next thing is to allow each institution to have full autonomy over the way those resources are used within the institution. Another place where the coordinating council on a statewide basis can help is to develop reduction-in-force policies and also some assistance programs to alleviate the potential human tragedies which come with reductions-in-force. Higher education has not yet reached the goal of what is the ultimate in the educational process.

Does planning for a decline set in motion that decline? A dilemma exists because a coordinating board will be criticized for failure in predicting what was going to happen. Yet anticipation of decline may contribute to a lack of service being provided for populations that may need it.

Despite faculty dislike of the situation, the decline in enrollment is forcing higher education institutions to open up to change, to evaluations and to cooperation and outreach.

Diversity

The two-year college mission by now has achieved stature and prestige, while at the research multiversity level the flagship institutions are well established. But in between there is a vacuum of role models for four-year public institutions as to what they could be with dignity, prestige and self-esteem. For example, the former teachers colleges have not yet found a mission that gives them the self-esteem or the students to make them politically viable.

Also unresolved is the mission of an urban university. All over the country these institutions that were not the major state research university now have the urban power base and the desire to become one even though more comprehensive state universities are not needed.

Finally, around the country there has emerged here and there the concept of a regional university that is closely linked to its surrounding areas and feeds into it, but insufficient esteem has been attached to that mission. It might be academically and politically feasible to develop these intermediate roles in order to alleviate the present allocations of function.

Although a number of very articulate spokesmen for state higher education boards have preferred to establish competitive market processes as a means for retrenchment within the states, there are very few state coordinating agencies that would want to commit themselves fully either to strict noncompetition or to a full market model. The issue is not of planning or of the market model but of the relationship between them.

When the impact of the market model hit, institutions tended to copy each other. They assumed, for example, that there was a single model of excellence in relation to an arts and science college or to a complex university. The end result, to some extent, was not a diversified system but a series of competing units trying to look like each other.

In order to have an effective free market in higher education there are two preconditions. One is the

presence of diverse opportunity, which requires planning. The second is the presence of effective counseling and guidance so a student has some reasonable basis for choice. The rules of fair competition include student aid, tuition levels, admission standards and geographic access; moreover, these are only small parts of a total package that the coordinating board has to fine tune over time.

One of the major functions in the planning process is to insure that effective diversity does, in fact, take place. The claim that is frequently made, that coordinating boards tend to homogenize the picture, is not true historically.

Planning

Cooperation between institutions and statewide boards requires a long-range strategic assessment of what is gained and lost. Because most institutional people live in a short-term, tactical environment, they have confrontation and conflict with the statewide board.

One of the real problems of the planning process has been the failure to relate it effectively to the legislative budgeting process. In a number of states the legislative committees did not even know that a plan existed, indicating a basic communication gap. The practical implementation of a plan has to be included in the budget, which is a legislative responsibility.

Financial aid is a perfect example of the situation in which recognition of the need for planning came long after the programs. Enormous amounts of money are placed in separate programs, each one justified for its own purpose but unrelated to all the others.

One hundred and twenty hours do not define an educated man nor sixty hours what a community college should be doing. Some states have done rather remarkable things in terms of tying campuses together with industry and with the community; yet there still is a need to find better means of judging proficiency. Instead of seeing the work of industry as a threat, one should recognize that these companies and inst tutions are involved in the continuing education of their employees, opening up potential educational opportunity both for students and for programs.

It is absolutely essential that the lines of communication and articulation between postsecondary and elementary-secondary education be strengthened.

Clearly in a good many states the tension in relation to budgets between higher education and elementary-secondary education will become more rather than less acute.

As part of its planning postsecondary education ought to look at compensatory education and consider how many times taxpayers must pay for basic skills and how long higher education can stay aloof from public criticism.

Perhaps planning should move from a conception of planned coordination to a contingency plan which foresees alternative futures, some of which include not only decline but also the possibilities of a stable situation or something different. One of the critically important functions of a state's planning agency is to plan for total community education. Also, time is required in terms of total planning for identifying needs and then adapting, if necessary, the parts of the traditional structure to meet these changing needs.

Planning for the future ought to consider the impact of the economy on certain kinds of factors. Who will really be affected by the enrollment decline? How does that relate to other social problems? Institutions have enticed a tremendous number of students into the postsecondary system and then have rejected a very high percentage of them. Doing a better job with the types of students already in the system would provide steady state enrollment without having to attract any more new kinds of students.

Appendix A

Some Highlights from Recent Studies on Statewide Coordination and Governance

by Janet R. Clarke

Introduction

While many of the state boards were created to deal with expansion of higher education, they now face a period of possible contraction, fiscal stringency and changing scope of issues. If anything, planning is even more critical under such changed conditions. Areas of tension continue to exist between boards and institutions on the one hand and executive and legislative branches of government on the other. Among the continuing areas of tension are issues of control versus autonomy, centralization versus decentralization, the changes of homogenization and the need for clarification of levels of administrative responsibility.

To these issues must be added the heightened tension and competition among the segments of postsecondary education including concern about the relation of vocational education, of proprietary institutions and of private higher education to state planning and financing. The issues are heightened by a tendency in a number of states for the executive and legislative branches of government to become more actively and directly involved in postsecondary education decision making.

It would seem clear that statewide planning and coordination in some form are here to stay. The critical question is not whether there will be boards of postsecondary or higher education, but how in their evolution they can more effectively serve the needs of students, citizens, institutions and state governments.[1] The primary responsibility for making opportunities in postsecondary education available to all citizens interested and capable of benefiting from them rests with the state, both constitutionally and historically. During the rapid expansion of postsecondary education in the sixties, most states established statewide agencies responsible for planning, coordination and/or governance of at least some major segments of their public and postsecondary institutions.[2]

The situation today poses new and difficult challenges to states, institutions and other agencies. It calls for a careful review of the forms of coordination, governance and structure to insure effective planning for the years ahead.

Janet R. Clarke is a research assistant for the Inservice Education Program of the Education Commission of the States.

Among the major problems are: increasing costs, stable or decreasing enrollments of traditional college-age people, increased competition for students, new concern over students' access and choice, a broader range of postsecondary educational institutions than ever, questions about innovation and more relevant instruction, changing student attitudes, increased interest in lifelong learning, institutional independence and accountability, more effective and efficient management and utilization of resources and questions of who shall pay and how much.

Clearly, without effective cooperation, coordination and planning on state and institutional levels, postsecondary education will be in for even more difficult times.[3]

Conclusions and Recommendations[4]

The Task Force on Coordination, Governance and Structure of the Education Commission of the States has addressed some of the critical concerns involved in coordination, governance and planning within and among the states. Following are the task force's principal conclusions and recommendations:

A. The states have the pre-eminent responsibility for postsecondary education.
   1. There is no one best formula or approach for planning, program review or budget review at the state level.
   2. The state must take into account the needs of all its citizens, the users of postsecondary educational resources, new approaches to educational delivery and the desirability of regional and interstate planning.
   3. The role of federal legislation should be to encourage an effective local-institutional-state-federal partnership in providing postsecondary educational opportunity for all interested and able citizens. Therefore, there is a need to develop federal legislation and guidelines for postsecondary education that take into account the uniqueness of individual states.

B. There is a diversity of forms of institutions of postsecondary education within the states and a necessity for states to insure and promote a variety of postsecondary educational opportunities.
   1. State planning should include clear definition of the objectives, role and scope of the various institutions and segments of postsecondary education.
   2. Institutions should be insured leeway in institutional operations.
   3. The appropriate state agency for postsecondary education should be charged to include the full range of postsecondary education in its planning activities.
   4. New means should be explored to encourage voluntary interinstitutional cooperation and complementation.

C. The task force calls particular attention to the changing population characteristics and social expectations that face postsecondary education in the period ahead, including a leveling-off or decrease in the traditional college-age population.
   1. Major efforts will continue to be necessary in all regions to provide postsecondary educational opportunity to students from economically disadvantaged and minority groups and women.

D. There are basic characteristics that an effective coordinating agency or governing agency charged with statewide planning should have today in order to meet current problems:
   1. Broadened responsibility for the range of postsecondary education.
   2. Concern for educational innovation and new forms of educational "delivery."
   3. Concern for articulation with:
      a. State departments of education.
      b. Career and occupational education.
      c. The various segments of what has been considered higher education.
      d. Individualized learning, home study, proprietary education and nontraditional studies.
      e. Other educational enterprises including industry, business, labor and the armed forces.

E. In states with multiple statewide postsecondary agencies dealing with state plans and/or dispersal of state and federal funds, these activities should be coordinated by one central coordinating agency.

F. Each state should determine levels of authority and responsibility of coordination and governance and should develop state plans suggesting levels of decision making consistent with that authority.

G. Planning and its effective implementation are the key to effective coordination and governance.
   1. Two critical objectives for the planning process must be pursued simultaneously:
      a. To determine the goals of postsecondary educational systems and the institutions and programs in the light of the changing needs of society.
      b. To use the planning process for continuous review to establish through institutional and community involvement, a consensus for the goals and their means of attainment.
   2. A flexible advisory structure assures that relevant information and advice will be received on a continuing basis.
   3. Essential to effective planning are an accurate and consistent assessment of current trends and changing conditions, and the reconsideration and reassessment of the means of attaining goals in the light of those changes.

H. The public responsibility for postsecondary education rests with the legislative and executive branches of state government. The legislative and executive branches of government should support planning and coordination through an appropriate state educational agency.
   1. The states and their agencies must delegate to governing boards the management of all operating funds within agreed-to broad areas of expenditure authorization, free of pre-audits by any state agency but subject to appropriate post-audits to determine that institutional and program objectives and proper fiscal management have been achieved.
   2. The state agency should be a primary, comprehensive and objective source of information and recommendations for the executive and legislative branches of government.

Powers Necessary for Coordination[5]

As a participatory agency, the coordinating board must rely on widespread consensus for its decisions and on persuasion and cooperation rather than fiat and pure power for policy and implementation. Nevertheless, certain legal powers are necessary to the board to underpin and reinforce the intent of the state to plan and create a comprehensive system. We recommend that the board have the following minimum powers:

1. to engage in continuous planning, both long-range and short-range;
2. to acquire information from all postsecondary institutions and agencies through the establishment of statewide management and data systems;
3. to review and approve new and existing degree programs, new campuses, extension centers, departments and centers of all public institutions, and, where substantial state aid is given, of all private institutions;
4. to review and make recommendations on any and all facets of both operating and capital budgets and, when requested by state authorities, present a consolidated budget for the whole system; and
5. to administer directly or have under its coordinative powers all state scholarship and grant programs to students, grant programs to nonpublic institutions, and all state-administered federal grant and aid programs.

Perhaps the key jurisdictional issue between the coordinating board and the institutional boards is where to draw the dividing line between their respective powers and responsibilities. Some coordinating staff members, impatient with group processes and widespread participation by interested parties and often lacking skill in leadership and persuasion, seek increased power to intervene directly into the legitimate provinces of institutional governing boards and their staffs. The exercise of such power finally leads both legislators and institutional leaders to the conclusion that institutional governing boards are superfluous. Thus, the chief advantages of coordination have been lost to the state and to the institutions.

If the coordinating board is not to preempt the raison d'etre of the institutional governing boards,

it should stay out of the following matters (and if the law now allows these interventions, the board should use great restraint in exercising the powers):

1. student affairs, *except* general admissions standards, enrollment mixes applicable to the various systems and subsystems of institutions;
2. faculty affairs (hiring, promotion, tenure, dismissal, salaries), *except* general guidelines applicable to salaries;
3. selection and appointment of any person at the institutional or agency level, including the president or chief executive and board members;
4. approval of travel, in-state or out-of-state, for staff of any institution;
5. planning of courses or programs, including their content, and selecting subjects of research;
6. presenting of arguments and supporting materials for institutional operating or capital budgets, *except* that the board should present and support its own recommendations on budgets;
7. contractual relationships for construction, land acquisition, equipment, and services;
8. general policing or maintenance of civil order on campus; and
9. negotiations and contractual relationships with unions representing institutional personnel, *except* that such negotiations may be conducted within guidelines and/or budgetary parameters set by the state or board.

A Model for a Statewide Coordinating Board or Commission[6]

1. Leadership and coordination in *(a)* formulation of statewide needs and policies, *(b)* long-range and short-range planning, *(c)* program development with statewide implications, and *(d)* establishment of statewide and institutional master plans for the development of programs and physical facilities at individual institutions. This includes the development of guidelines, standards and, occasionally, basic procedures to guide the operation of individual institutions.
2. Approval of institutional objectives on which to base yearly institutional budget requests, consistent with statewide planning, guidelines and previously approved college master plans. Recommendation of the agreed-upon budget to the statewide board and organization of the presentations and support of the budget requests to the executive and legislative branches of government.
3. Appraisal and evaluation of institutional achievement of approved objectives, including fiscal post-audit and analysis of institutional application of statewide policies and guidelines. This includes a periodic review of institutional progress in achieving agreed-upon objectives and in solving problems inherent in the local situation.
4. Advice to individual institutions, as needed and requested, on operational matters. Responsibility and authority for operational decisions necessary for institutional implementation of systemwide policies and programs, should be located on each campus. Statewide officers have an obligation to restrict their role to statewide activities.

Collective Bargaining[7]

Perhaps the most unique administrative feature of higher education in the United States is the aspiration of administrators and faculty as to the proper principles of academic government. In the main, universities and colleges either are governed by or are aiming ultimately for a system of governance commonly known as shared authority.

In practice, many faculty and other professional employees have come to believe that the academic enterprise is different from other organizations and must be governed with a clear understanding of the controlling weight of professional judgments which they alone are capable of making.

The faculty aim is to participate in and have effective influence over matters which are considered management prerogatives in industry and other organizations. More specificially, traditional management functions such as staffing and planning require substantial faculty input and/or effective influence, it is hypothesized, if high quality education is to be achieved. Faculty normally

have effective control over the selection, promotion and reward of faculty members, standards for admission, graduation requirements, standards for the award of degrees, and the scope and quality of educational programs and courses. These matters are the very substance of the services expected from an academic institution.

Kenneth Kahn has argued that the unique features of college and university governance will be distorted by the traditional industrial model of collective bargaining as it is constituted under the National Labor Relations Act. A task force for the American Association of Higher Education reported faculty concerns to be legitimate in the following five categories: educational and administrative policies, personnel administration, economic issues, public issues and the institution and procedures for faculty representation. In addition, the faculty has a consuming interest in the following issues: admissions standards, the content of curricula, degree requirements, grading standards, standards for academic freedom, standards for student conduct and discipline, and procedures for appointment of department chairman, deans and the president. Such issues would be traditionally outside the scope of bargaining in the private sector.

The second distortion of an industrial model of collective bargaining would be in the area of defining the bargaining unit.

A third area of distortion is the changes in the concept and practices of shared authority.

It has been suggested that the most common mechanism for achieving shared authority at the campus level is the faculty or academic senate. It is here that the fourth area of distortion may occur. Under traditional labor legislation in many state collective bargaining statutes, the continuing operation of a faculty senate, where there is a certified exclusive bargaining representative, may be held to be an unfair labor practice.

The fundamental purpose of any legislation should be to effect, in whole or in part, a policy which will prove to be in the public interest. The basic question arising in this instance is whether or not collective bargaining for personnel in postsecondary education and legislative provision therefore is in the public interest and, if so, what rights, privileges, perquisites, responsibilities, duties, limitations, etc., may naturally attach thereto.

A number of subsidiary questions must be considered: Does it promote public welfare? Does it contribute to public harmony? What are the benefits of contracts? Should there be separate legislation for postsecondary education? With postsecondary education's varied population, who should be excluded? Position of administrators? Nonprofessional employees? Student employees? Student qua student? Are existing collective bargaining agencies for the private sector appropriate for postsecondary? Should there be the right to strike? Are there alternative mechanisms? Who is the public employer? Can academic collective bargaining be adapted to the hierarchy of state structures? What should be the length of contracts? How does the concept of "exclusive agent" relate to traditional individualism in postsecondary education?

---

1. Richard M. Millard, "State Boards of Higher Education," ERIC 1976.
2. *Coordination or Chaos?* Report No. 43 (October 1973) of the Task Force on Coordination, Governance and Structure of Postsecondary Education. Education Commission of the States.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Lyman Glenny et al., *Coordinating Higher Education for the '70s* (Berkeley, California: Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, 1971), pp. 7 and 12. By permission of the Center for Studies in Higher Education, formerly the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
6. Fred F. Harcleroad, *Planning for State Systems of Postsecondary Education* (Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1973), pp. 6-7. Reprinted by permission.
7. *Collective Bargaining in Postsecondary Educational Institutions.* Report No. 45 (March 1974) of the Education Commission of the States.

Appendix B

Conference Participants

George E. Ayers
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Metropolitan State University
121 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Robert Berdahl
Professor of Higher Education
Department of Higher Education
479 Baldy Hall
State University of New York
Buffalo, New York 14260

Roger Bergerson
Senate Research
Minnesota State Senate
State Capitol
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Robert Bonine
Assistant Executive Director
Northwest Area Foundation
W-975 First National Bank Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Vincent J. Carillot
Educational Coordinator for the House Appropriations Committee
House Fiscal Agency
Mutual Building
Lansing, Michigan 48901

Blake Cherrington
American Council on Education Administration Fellow
102 Morrill Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Janet Clarke
Research Assistant
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80203

Kathy M. Conlon
Student Trustee
University of Illinois
818 South Wolcott
Chicago, Illinois 60612

Harry P. Day
President
Spring Hill Center
Box 288
Wayzata, Minnesota 55391

Emil A. Erickson
President
Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board
Virginia, Minnesota 55792

Peter X. Fugina
State Representative and Chairman, Higher Education Committee
5 Merritt Drive
Virginia, Minnesota 55792

William S. Fuller
Executive Director
Nebraska Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education
Box 95005
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Richard C. Gilman
President
Occidental College
1600 Campus Road
Los Angeles, California 90041

H.A. "Barney" Goltz
State Senator and Chairman
Higher Education Committee
State of Washington
Legislative Building
Olympia, Washington 98504

James W. Hall
President
SUNY Empire State College
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866

Garry D. Hays
Chancellor
State University System
407 Capitol Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Philip C. Helland
Chancellor
State Board for Community Colleges
301 Capitol Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Jerome M. Hughes
State Senator
328 Capitol
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Clyde R. Ingle
Executive Director
Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board
400 Capitol Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Elizabeth Johnson
Member of Board
Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission
Box 356
Redmond, Oregon 97756

Lowell E. Johnson
Faculty Fellow in Humanities
The Newberry Library
60 West Walton Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610

Geri Joseph
Contributing Editor
Minneapolis Tribune
425 Portland Avenue
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55488

Joyce Krupey
Research Division
471 State Office Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

John Linnell
Vice President for Instruction
Macalester College
St. Paul, Minnesota 55105

Carl Lutz
Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education
Commission for Higher Education
143 West Market Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

Thurston E. Manning
Executive Director
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
1221 University Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Richard M. Millard
Director
Higher Education Services
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80203

G. Theodore Mitau
Distinguished Service Professor
Minnesota State University System
495 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

John Moseley
President
Austin College
900 North Grand
Sherman, Texas 75090

John O'Connell
Student Trustee
Massachusetts State College System
40 Raymond Avenue
Salem, Massachusetts 01970

Paul Olson
Senior Program Associate
Northwest Area Foundation
W-975 First Natl. Bank Bldg.
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Melvin Orwig
Associate Director
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
Boulder, Colorado 80303

Jerome M. Pollack
President
Fairleigh Dickinson University
Rutherford, New Jersey 07070

William J. Priest
Chancellor, Dallas County Community College District
701 Elm Street, Room 400
Dallas, Texas 75202

Louis Rabineau
Director
Inservice Education Program
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80203

Alvin Rivera
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education
Dept. of HEW, Room 309G
200 Independence Avenue S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

James Rosser
Vice Chancellor
Board of Higher Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Jack Rossman
American Council on
Education
Administration Fellow
Macalester College
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Harvey Stegemoeller
Executive Director
Minnesota Private College
Council
10 Capitol Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Carol Van Alstyne
American Council on
Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert Von Der Lippe
Faculty Trustee
Hampshire College
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

Austin Wehrwein
The Minneapolis Star
425 Portland Avenue
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55488

James H. Werntz
Director
Center for Educational
Development
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Spring Hill Center, an independent foundation and conference center, serves as a catalyst for the clarification of important local, national and international issues, especially those affecting the Upper Midwest. Primarily through its own program planning efforts and by initiating cooperative approaches with community groups and public and private institutions, the Center brings together the human resources necessary to help individuals and organizations plan and carry out their own goals. Spring Hill provides a reflective environment which enhances creative thought and deepens understanding of issues. The search for new perspectives for planned, creative change is supported by the belief that individuals, groups and communities have a greater potential for growth by working together. Spring Hill Center, Box 288, Wayzata, Minnesota 55391.

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) is a nonprofit organization formed by interstate compact in 1966 to further working relationships among governors, state legislators and educators for the improvement of education at all levels. Forty-six states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are members of ECS. The Commission provides information on state-related educational activities and suggests options and alternatives to meet specific state needs. The Inservice Education Program is a project of the Higher Education Services Department of ECS. The project brings together educators, government officials and other interested individuals to address issues facing postsecondary education at the state level. The project is supported primarily by a five-year grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation with additional funds provided by the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association. Education Commission of the States, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295.

ISBN 0-932676-05-7